

**ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED**

0.2
Sh
3
03491


M. L.

BASEMENT STORAGE

REFERENCE

STC

**ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED**



494
A HISTORY

OF THE

COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH,

FROM THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

BY THE

RIGHT REV. CHARLES JOSEPH HEFELE, D.D.,

BISHOP OF ROTTENBURG,

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF TUBINGEN.

43
VOLUME III.

A.D. 431 TO A.D. 451.

Translated from the German, with the Author's approbation, and Edited by the
Editor of Hagenbach's History of Doctrines.

THE
NEWBERRY
LIBRARY
CHICAGO

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

1883.

94

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-EMD-208

1803491

HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH.

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

THE Editor's Preface to the present edition of his work has already appeared in the second volume of the English Translation. It is now complete, and this History begins in many ways to be a history of the Church, and of dogmas which are of importance to it. It is a history of the great truth of the Church, and it is the chief object of the work. The Author's object is to show that the Church is a living body, and that it is the only body which can be truly called the Church. It is a body which is always growing, and which is always changing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a struggle, and which is always in the midst of a victory. It is a body which is always in the midst of a sacrifice, and which is always in the midst of a triumph. It is a body which is always in the midst of a death, and which is always in the midst of a resurrection. It is a body which is always in the midst of a pain, and which is always in the midst of a joy. It is a body which is always in the midst of a sorrow, and which is always in the midst of a hope. It is a body which is always in the midst of a despair, and which is always in the midst of a faith. It is a body which is always in the midst of a doubt, and which is always in the midst of a certainty. It is a body which is always in the midst of a question, and which is always in the midst of an answer. It is a body which is always in the midst of a problem, and which is always in the midst of a solution. It is a body which is always in the midst of a mystery, and which is always in the midst of a revelation. It is a body which is always in the midst of a secret, and which is always in the midst of a disclosure. It is a body which is always in the midst of a hidden thing, and which is always in the midst of an open thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a closed thing, and which is always in the midst of an open thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a dark thing, and which is always in the midst of a light thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a cold thing, and which is always in the midst of a warm thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a dry thing, and which is always in the midst of a wet thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a hard thing, and which is always in the midst of a soft thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a rough thing, and which is always in the midst of a smooth thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a sharp thing, and which is always in the midst of a blunt thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a strong thing, and which is always in the midst of a weak thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a brave thing, and which is always in the midst of a cowardly thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a noble thing, and which is always in the midst of a base thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a good thing, and which is always in the midst of a bad thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a true thing, and which is always in the midst of a false thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a right thing, and which is always in the midst of a wrong thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a just thing, and which is always in the midst of an unjust thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a fair thing, and which is always in the midst of an unfair thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a honest thing, and which is always in the midst of a dishonest thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a pure thing, and which is always in the midst of an impure thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a clean thing, and which is always in the midst of a dirty thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a bright thing, and which is always in the midst of a dark thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a clear thing, and which is always in the midst of a cloudy thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a calm thing, and which is always in the midst of a stormy thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a quiet thing, and which is always in the midst of a noisy thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a still thing, and which is always in the midst of a moving thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a peaceful thing, and which is always in the midst of a warlike thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a gentle thing, and which is always in the midst of a harsh thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a kind thing, and which is always in the midst of a cruel thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a merciful thing, and which is always in the midst of an unmerciful thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a forgiving thing, and which is always in the midst of an unforgiving thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a patient thing, and which is always in the midst of an impatient thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a humble thing, and which is always in the midst of an arrogant thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a lowly thing, and which is always in the midst of a lofty thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a simple thing, and which is always in the midst of a complex thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a plain thing, and which is always in the midst of a fancy thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a common thing, and which is always in the midst of a rare thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a usual thing, and which is always in the midst of an unusual thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a ordinary thing, and which is always in the midst of an extraordinary thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a common thing, and which is always in the midst of a rare thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a usual thing, and which is always in the midst of an unusual thing. It is a body which is always in the midst of a ordinary thing, and which is always in the midst of an extraordinary thing.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, GEORGE HERBERT.

NEW YORK, SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

Consequently, this volume presents an insight which attaches to every chapter and is marked by an unity which is without parallel in historical literature. The Author has felt strongly that the subject was vital to the Church of Christ, and he has not hesitated to point to the consequences of her not heeding to her upon the dissolution of his faith. It is a right to know every thing that can be known regarding the history of the Church and its history, and the power of that history by the Catholic Church.

Consequently, this volume presents an insight upon its subjects which has been most devoted to him—the Author's name and the history of the Pope of Rome by the Catholic Church. It will be quite clear to the reader that the language of this work will be written by

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

THE Author's Preface to this portion of his work has already appeared in the second volume of the English Translation. He there remarks that this History "becomes in many ways very like a history of the Church and of dogmas, which will be no prejudice to it." This is, of course, the exact truth of the matter, and it is the chief interest of the work. The *History of the Councils* differs from that of *Doctrines* in dealing only with those questions which come formally before the Church in her Synods. Both are of inestimable value, and of absolute necessity, to all who aspire to the name of theologian.

In the présent volume this view of the subject is made more prominent than in any other; as the whole of its contents, with some slight exceptions, refer to the controversy respecting the Person of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the two great conflicts of the Church with Nestorianism and Eutychianism. It begins with an account of the rise of the former, and ends with the condemnation of the latter at the great Synod of Chalcedon.

Consequently, this volume possesses an interest which attaches to hardly any other, and is marked by an unity which is seldom attainable in historical narrative. The Author has felt throughout that the subject was vital to the Church of Christ then and now, and he has spared no pains to bring the resources of his vast learning to bear upon the elucidation of his theme. As a result, we know nearly everything that can be known respecting the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches, and the reason of their rejection by the Catholic Church.

Considerable light is thrown by this volume upon two subjects which have been much debated of late—the Athanasian Creed and the relation of the Pope of Rome to the Christian Church. It will be quite clear to the reader that the *Quicunque Vult* could not have been written by

S. Athanasius; but it will be equally clear that it does little more than embody the phrases respecting the Person of Christ which were sanctioned in the Creed that was drawn up at Chalcedon. To theological students who really grapple with the essential elements of the question, it will also be plain that the theological or Christological phrases in the "Athanasian Creed" to which the greatest exception has been taken, are simple and necessary contradictions of Nestorianism and Eutychianism, either of which heresies would have undermined the Nicene faith.

With regard to the Papacy, it is inevitable that a non-Roman Editor should take exception to some of Bishop Hefele's remarks in the 28th canon of Chalcedon. We, of course, believe that the Council in that canon stated the exact truth respecting the position assigned to the Bishop of Rome. This, however, is a matter of opinion, and we only caution the reader that he may form a judgment for himself.

Of the other points on which differences of opinion will exist, we need refer only to the character of Cyril of Alexandria, who presided at the Council of Ephesus. Many will think that Bishop Hefele has dealt partially with this great and powerful man. It will probably seem to most that he behaved with unnecessary haste in opening the Synod before the arrival of the Antiochenes. On the other hand, there seems no reason to doubt that his antagonists purposely delayed their arrival, and gave him to understand that the proceedings might begin. At any rate, the Author appears to have stated the case with all possible accuracy.

It is inevitable that errata should occur in this volume. The Editor has already discovered the word "Dyophysite" spelt "Diophysite" in two places. Great care has been taken to secure accuracy, and it is hoped that no serious error may remain. The Editor has been indebted to several friends, and especially to one accomplished friend whose assistance has been invaluable. He will welcome any suggestions which may be offered for the improvement of his work; and he is bound, in conclusion, to acknowledge the great pains taken by the experienced publishers and printers in order that every possibility of error might be guarded against.

CONTENTS.

BOOK IX.

THE THIRD ŒCUMENICAL SYNOD AT EPHESUS, A.D. 431.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY HISTORY.

	PAGE
SEC. 127. The Pre-Nestorian Doctrine on the Union of the Two Natures in Christ,	1
„ 128. Nestorius,	9
„ 129. The Conflict between Cyril and Nestorius begins,	17
„ 130. Synod at Rome, A.D. 430, and the Transactions connected with it,	25
„ 131. Synod at Alexandria,	28
„ 132. The Anathematisms of Cyril and the Counter-Anathematisms of Nestorius,	31

CHAPTER II.

BEGINNING, CONFLICT, AND VICTORY OF THE SYNOD OF EPHESUS.

SEC. 133. Convocation of the Synod—The Papal and Imperial Commissioners,	40
„ 134. First Session, June 22, 431.—Presidency and Number of those present,	44
„ 135. Opposition. The Conciliabulum of the Antiochene Bishops,	53
„ 136. Letter of the Orthodox. Their Second Session, July 10,	61
„ 137. Third Session at Ephesus, July 11, 431.—Two Synodal Letters,	64
„ 138. Fourth Session at Ephesus, July 16, 431,	65
„ 139. Fifth Session at Ephesus, July 17, 431, and Two Synodal Letters,	66
„ 140. Sixth Session at Ephesus, July 22, 431,	70
„ 141. Seventh Session at Ephesus. Circular Letter and Canons,	71

	PAGE
SEC. 142. The Affairs of Pamphylia, the Massalians, Thrace, and the See of Jerusalem,	76
„ 143. Both Parties at Ephesus appeal to the Emperor,	77
„ 144. Resolution of the Emperor. Arrest of Cyril, Memnon, and Nestorius. Distress of the Synod,	82
„ 145. The Creed of the Antiochenes. Their subsequent Letters,	93
„ 146. The Emperor summons before him Deputies from both sides,	96
„ 147. The Deputies of both Parties are summoned to Chalcedon,	99
„ 148. The Emperor decides in favour of the Orthodox, and summons their Deputies to Constantinople,	104
„ 149. The Ephesine Synod is dissolved,	109
„ 150. Slanders on Cyril and S. Pulcheria,	112

CHAPTER III.

PROCEEDINGS WITH A VIEW TO UNION BETWEEN CYRIL AND THE ANTIOCHENES. OVERTHROW OF NESTORIANISM.

SEC. 151. The Rupture still continues. Synods at Constantinople, Tarsus, and Antioch,	115
„ 152. The Pope and the Emperor attempt to mediate. Synods at Constantinople and Antioch,	118
„ 153. Aristolaus travels to Alexandria. The Hopes of Peace increase,	121
„ 154. Paul of Emisa is sent to Alexandria as Mediator,	127
„ 155. The Union-Creed of the Antiochenes : it is accepted by Cyril,	129
„ 156. Synod of the Antiochenes : Cyril's Presents,	133
„ 157. The Union takes place,	134
„ 158. The Union finds Opponents, but is defended by Cyril,	139
„ 159. The Union is at last, although not without constraint, accepted universally,	148
„ 160. Attack upon Theodore of Mopsuestia. Synods in Armenia and Antioch. Overthrow of Nestorianism,	154

BOOK X.

THE INTERVAL BETWEEN THE THIRD AND FOURTH ŒCUMENICAL COUNCILS.

CHAPTER I.

THE SYNODS HELD BEFORE THE BREAKING OUT OF THE EUTYCHIAN CONTROVERSY.

SEC. 161. Synod at Riez in the year 439,	157
„ 162. Synod at Orange, A.D. 441,	159

	PAGE
SEC. 163. First Synod at Vaison, A.D. 442,	164
„ 164. Second Synod of Arles, A.D. 443 or 452,	167
„ 165. Synods at Rome and Bescançon, A.D. 444 and 445,	171
„ 166. Three Oriental Synods at Ephesus, at Antioch, and in the Province of Hierapolis,	173
„ 167. Spanish Synods, on account of the Priscillianists, in the years 446, 447,	175
„ 168. Synods in Gaul, in Britain, and in Rome, A.D. 447,	178
„ 169. Synod at Antioch, A.D. 447 or 448. Two Assemblies at Berytus and Tyre,	178

CHAPTER II.

EUTYCHES AND THE SYNOD AT CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 448.

SEC. 170. The Monophysites begin the Conflict. Bishop Irenæus and Theodoret are persecuted,	182
„ 171. Eutyches and his Accusers,	186
„ 172. Synod at Constantinople, A.D. 448,	189
„ 173. Eutyches and Flavian both endeavour to gain over public opinion to their side,	204
„ 174. The Examination on account of the pretended Falsification of the Synodal Acts,	211

CHAPTER III.

THE ROBBER-SYNOD.

SEC. 175. Convocation of the Synod,	221
„ 176. The celebrated Epistola Dogmatica of Leo to Flavian,	225
„ 177. Subsequent Letters of Pope Leo the Great on account of Eutyches,	237
„ 178. The Proceedings at the Robber-Synod, according to their own Acts,	241
„ 179. Testimonies of Antiquity respecting the Robber-Synod,	252
„ 180. Fortunes of the Papal Legates who had been deputed to the Robber-Synod,	260

CHAPTER IV.

THE ROBBER-SYNOD IS TO BE CONFRONTED BY A NEW
AND GREATER COUNCIL.

SEC. 181. Theodosius II. for, Pope Leo I. against, the Robber-Synod. Synods at Rome and Milan,	263
„ 182. Pulcheria and Marcian come to the Throne,	268
„ 183. Synods at Constantinople,	271

	PAGE
Sec. 184. Pope Leo wishes to restore Ecclesiastical Unity without a new Council,	273
„ 185. The Emperor Marcian summons an Œcumenical Council. The Pope assents, and nominates Legates,	277

BOOK XI.

THE FOURTH ŒCUMENICAL SYNOD AT CHALCEDON, A.D. 451.

SEC. 186. Number and Place of the Sessions,	285
„ 187. The Synodal Acts and the Translations of them,	288
„ 188. The Imperial Commissioners and the Papal Legates. Presidency and Number of those present,	295
„ 189. First Session, October 8, 451,	298
„ 190. Second Session, October 10, 451,	315
„ 191. Third Session, October 13, 451,	320
„ 192. Fourth Session, October 17, 451,	329
„ 193. Fifth Session, October 22, 451. The Decree concerning the Faith,	342
„ 194. Sixth Session, October 25, 451,	353
„ 195. Seventh and Eighth Sessions, October 26, 451,	355
„ 196. Ninth and Tenth Sessions, October 27 and 28, 451,	358
„ 197. Eleventh Session, October 29, 451,	370
„ 198. Twelfth and Thirteenth Sessions, October 30, 451,	375
„ 199. Fourteenth Session, October 31, 451, and its two Continuations,	379
„ 200. Fifteenth Session. The Canons,	383
„ 201. Sixteenth and last Session, November 1, 451,	422
„ 202. The Title : Œcumenical Patriarch,	429
„ 203. Synodal Letter to the Pope. He is asked to confirm the Decrees,	429
„ 204. Answer of the Pope. He rejects the 28th Canon,	433
„ 205. Imperial Edicts in favour of the Synod of Chalcedon, and against the Monophysites,	438
„ 206. Further Correspondence between Rome and Constantinople. Leo confirms the Doctrinal Decree of Chalcedon,	441
„ 207. The Greeks seem to sacrifice the 28th Canon,	446
„ 208. Subsequent History of Monophysitism,	449

INDEX,	465
------------------	-----

HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS.

BOOK IX.

THE THIRD ŒCUMENICAL SYNOD AT EPHESUS, A.D. 431.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY HISTORY.

SEC. 127. *The Pre-Nestorian Doctrine on the Union of the Two Natures in Christ.*

IN opposition to the Docetæ, the Church had maintained the true manhood of Christ; in opposition to the Ebionites, Arians, and others, His true Godhead. The development of doctrine and of science now led necessarily to the special christological question: In what manner the divine and human natures in Christ were united. The fact that they were closely united was an established portion of the faith of the Church, but the manner of the union had not yet become the subject of exact consideration; and as often as the ancient Fathers touched this point, they employed vague formulæ and expressions. Thus Ignatius calls our Lord a *σαρκοφόρος* (*Ad Smyrn.* c. 5); Tertullian recommends us to say, that the Logos *put on* humanity, *carne est indutus*, as being better than *caro factus*, because the latter expression would lead one to think of a *transfiguratio* of the flesh (*Adv. Præscam.* c. 27). Origen, again, defines the union of the two natures as an interweaving (*συννυφαίεσθαι*), and still more frequently he (*Adv. Cels.* iii. 41; *De Princip.* iii. 6, 3), as well as Irenæus (iii. 19, 1), Methodius, and later writers, used the expression *κρᾶσις* = mixture or mingling, and the Latins the similar expression *commixtio*. Thus, Tertullian (*Apology.* c. 21)

says, Christ is *homo Deo mistus*; Cyprian (*De vanit. idol.* p. 228, ed. Paris, 1726) says, *Deus cum homine miscetur*; Lactantius (iv. 13) says, *Deus est et homo, ex utroque genere permistus*. They also speak of a running together, *συνδρομή*, of the two natures, of their *copulatio, connexio*, and the like; and it was only at the time of the fourth Œcumenical Council, and by its means, that the question as to the manner of the union of the two natures received an authoritative solution by the doctrine of the *unio hypostatica*. According to this, the two natures of Christ are *unseparated* and *inseparable*, but are also united *untransformed* and *unmingled* in the one divine personality (*ὑπόστασις*) of the Logos. The personality in Christ, however, is neither a double (divine and human) personality, nor a mingled (divine-human) personality, but the pure personality of the Logos, who has united Himself only with a human *nature*, not with a human *person*, since otherwise the *unity* would be lost, and we should be obliged to accept the anomaly of two persons in one individual manifestation (Christ), either in *juxtaposition* or *mingled* (and thus also a mingling of the natures).

About a hundred years before this ecclesiastical solution of the great christological question was given, another was attempted in an erroneous manner by the learned *Apollinaris*, Bishop of Laodicea in Syria. He transferred the doctrine of the trichotomy from the Psychology of Plato to Christology in such a manner as to teach that, as the ordinary man consists of three factors, body, soul, and spirit, so the God-man consists of three factors, body, soul, and *Λόγος*. The last, according to his view, took the place of the human spirit (*πνεῦμα*), and was combined with the two lower factors so as to constitute an unity. In this way he certainly brought the humanity and divinity in Christ into an unity, so that they were not merely in juxtaposition and yet distinct; and he considered that he was not simply justified in adopting this theory of union, but even under a necessity of doing so. So long, he thought, as a human *πνεῦμα* is ascribed to Christ, we must also assign to Him the *liberty*, and at the same time the *mutability* (*τὸ τρεπτόν*), which would endanger the certainty of our redemption. It seemed to him possible to save this,

and at the same time to obtain a comprehensible idea of the union of the two natures by denying to Christ a human *πνεῦμα*. But Apollinaris overlooked the fact that, by such a theory, there was no true God-man, and that he had destroyed the true and perfect manhood of the Redeemer.

The error of the Apollinarian system was recognized and opposed by many teachers of the Church, especially by Athanasius, the two Gregories, of Nazianzus and of Nyssa, and Epiphanius; and their chief merit in this controversy was, that they held fast at the same time the true Godhead of our Lord and His uncurtailed manhood, and developed the *necessity* of a reasonable human soul in Christ. But, when they proceeded to speak of the *manner* of the union of the two natures, their expressions became vague and liable to be misunderstood, and in part even erroneous. Thus, on the one hand, Epiphanius (*Anchorat.* §§ 44, and 81) certainly rejected with propriety the expression *mixture* or confusion (*σύγχυσις*) of the two natures, and the notion of the one being transformed into the other (*οὐ τραπεῖς τὴν φύσιν*); but, on the other hand, he nevertheless makes use of the scarcely less objectionable phrase, *τὰ δύο κεράσας εἰς ἓν*, that is, "that Christ has made the two natures to unite into one." Similarly is it with Athanasius. He defines the union of the two natures with the expression which afterwards became famous, *ἀσύγχυτος φυσικὴ ἔνωσις τοῦ λόγου πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ γενομένην σάρκα* (*Adv. Apollinar.* i. 10, t. i. P. ii. p. 742, ed. Patav.), and thus certainly denies the *mingling* of the two natures; but, when he (*l.c.* c. 12) defines the *ἔνωσις φυσικὴ* more exactly as an *ἔνωσις κατὰ φύσιν*, and expressly as *not* an *ἔνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν*, one should suppose, at the first glance, that he is asserting hereby the opposite of the orthodox doctrine of the *unio hypostatica*. This, however, is not the case, for by the expression *ἔνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν*, the whole connection shows that he means not the union in one *Person*, but a *substantial union*, and he says with perfect propriety that the two natures in Christ cannot become substantially one. Still his expression *ἔνωσις φυσικὴ* or *κατὰ φύσιν* remains liable to be misunderstood, as though he intended thereby to teach monophysitism, while in reality he uses

φύσιν, as in the other case he uses ὑπόστασις, not in our exactly defined sense, which belongs to a later period, but with a more general meaning, and intends to say nothing else than that the two natures are united into one, or into one Person.¹ If the Confession of Faith attributed to Athanasius, περὶ τῆς σαρκώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου (*Opp.* t. ii. p. 1, ed. Patav.), is genuine, Athanasius would have taught οὐ δύο φύσεις, and would have used the expression μίαν φύσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένην. But this writing is not genuine, and belongs rather to Apollinaris than to S. Athanasius, as is acknowledged not only by Montfaucon of S. Maur in his edition of the works of S. Athanasius, and after him by Möhler, but also by Münscher in his *Textbook of the History of Doctrines* (i. p. 273), although in his earlier *Manual of the History of Doctrines* (iv. p. 15) he maintained the Athanasian authorship. From what has been said, however, it does not follow that Athanasius never used the expression μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη, which besides could be employed with a perfectly orthodox meaning: the phrase seems in fact to have met with general acceptance in Egypt, and was by Cyril and Dioscurus referred to Athanasius, and held as an acknowledged watchword of orthodoxy.

When, later, the two Gregories, of Nazianzus and of Nyssa, took part in the battle against Apollinarianism, they put forth definitely and expressly the *duality* of the natures, particularly Gregory Nazianzen (φύσεις μὲν δύο, Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος, υἱοὶ δὲ οὐ δύο, *Orat.* 51); but both also speak of a σύγκρασις and ἀνάκρασις, that is, a *mingling* of the two natures, and Gregory Nyssen besides cannot entirely free himself from the notion of a transmutation of the human nature into the divine.²

The great teachers of the Antiochene school, at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth centuries, not satisfied with all that had been done, thought themselves bound to strike out a new path, so as to define in an intelligible

¹ Cf. Möhler, *Athanasius*, Bd. ii. S. 280; and Dorner, *Lehre von der Person Christi*, 2 Aufl. Bd. i. S. 1072. That φύσις is frequently employed in the fourth century, e.g. by Apollinaris, in the sense of *Person*, is maintained by Münscher, *Lehrb. d. Dogmeng.* i. S. 278.

² Münscher, *Lehrb.* i. S. 274, 8, and 276, 9, and 298. [Cf. Hagenbach, § 99, Eng. Tr. i. pp. 386-389.]

manner the union of the two natures. All their predecessors seemed to them to have preserved insufficiently the particular and inviolable character of each nature, and not to have given a sufficiently fundamental opposition to Apollinaris, but to have more or less given in to his views. And thus Apollinaris now found much more violent opponents in his own native country, Syria, than elsewhere, men of high reputation and great endowments, particularly Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore afterwards Bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia. In the latter we behold the special representative and spokesman of this school, who, further developing and rectifying the ideas of Diodorus, built up a new christological system.¹

In opposition to Apollinaris, Theodore holds most decidedly that *complete* humanity and so also moral freedom must be ascribed to the Redeemer. In order, however, to keep at a distance from the notion of the mutability of Christ,—a theory which, however objectionable, seemed to be involved in that of His liberty,—Theodore did not allow the idea of liberty to result in that of liberty of choice, but went on to the idea of a higher, ethical liberty, which consists in the unchangeable harmony of the human will with the divine, and ascribed to the human nature of Christ such a higher liberty, a kind of liberty which practically excluded all sin. So far he was right. But he further regarded the union of the divine and human in Christ only in the sense of *ἐνοίκησις*, that is, *indwelling*, because to him the idea of *Incarnation* seemed to be identical with *transmutation* of the Logos into a man, and was therefore rejected by him as absurd. When, however, God dwells in any one, he thinks, He does not dwell in Him according to His nature, and so not by the expression of His power, but by His good pleasure (*εὐδοκία*). This indwelling is not alike in all the righteous, but its measure is determined by the measure of the divine *εὐδοκία*. But in no one did it take place in so

¹ Of his writings only fragments remain, particularly in the Acts of the fifth Œcumenical Synod, *Collat.* iv. et v.; in Hardouin, *Coll. Concil.* t. iii. p. 72 sqq., 92 sqq.; in Mansi, *Coll. Concil.* t. ix. p. 203 sqq.; also in Galland, *Bibl. Patrum*, t. xii. p. 690; and Münsteri, *Fragm. P.P. Græc.*, Hafniae, 1788. Cf. Fritsche, *De Theodori Mopsuest. vita et Scriptis*, Halle, 1837. Theodore's *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets* was unknown until it was discovered by Angelo Mai, and published in his *Nova Collectio Script. vet.* t. vi. pp. 1-293.

high a degree as in Christ. In order to show mankind its future perfected condition, to which it was destined, God formed a man in a miraculous manner, in the womb of the Virgin, by the Holy Ghost; and in the moment in which this man was formed, the Logos united Himself with Him. After some time the Logos led the man to baptism, then to death, then raised Him again, took Him up into heaven, placed Him (by reason of His union with Himself) at the right hand of the Father, and from that time He (the man) is worshipped by all and will judge all.

As every one who strives after righteousness progresses in union with God, so also it is with Christ. His union with the Logos had first begun with His conception and birth, and now increased gradually as moral union, wherein His humanity was constantly impelled, elevated, strengthened, and preserved from all aberrations by the indwelling Logos. This moral union was confirmed and strengthened peculiarly in the temptations and at the passion of Christ, but it receives its perfection only after the death of Christ, when He has exchanged the state of humiliation for that of exaltation.

If, according to this theory, the union of the divine and human in Christ is placed on the same level with the union of the divine good-pleasure with every righteous man, yet the two are in the highest degree essentially different, and Christ can in no way be compared with men. On the contrary, He transcends all men (*a*) by His supernatural birth, and (*b*) by His sinlessness; but (*c*) also in this respect, that it is not merely the *eὐδοκία* of God generally, but the Logos, and so God Himself, the second Person of the Trinity, who dwells in Him; and (*d*) the Logos is so closely united with the man in whom He dwells, that He has destined him to participate in all the honours which properly belong to the Logos alone.¹

It is true that in this manner Theodore could maintain the two natures in their perfection, and fundamentally oppose all mingling of the two; and he also explains that this is his aim, when he says, "Mingling is not suitable for the two natures;

¹ Compare Hardouin and Mansi, *ll. cc.* §§ 59, 60, 2, 3, 10, 27; and the account of the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia, by Gengler, in the *Tübing. theol. Quartalschrift*, 1835, Heft 2, S. 226 f., and Dorner, *l.c.* Bd. ii. S. 33 ff.

there is a difference between the divine form and the form of a servant, between the temple which is adopted and Him who dwells therein, between Him who was dissolved in death and Him who raised Him, between Him who was made perfect through sufferings and Him who perfected Him, and so forth. This difference must be preserved: each nature remains indissoluble by itself, in its essence."¹ But Theodore, and here is his fundamental error, not merely maintained the existence of two *natures* in Christ, but of two *persons*, as, he says himself, no subsistence can be thought of as perfect without personality. As, however, he did not ignore the fact that the consciousness of the Church rejected such a double personality in Christ, he endeavoured to get rid of the difficulty, and he repeatedly says expressly: "The two natures united together make only one Person, as man and wife are only one flesh. . . . If we consider the natures in their distinction, we should define the nature of the Logos as perfect and complete, and so also His Person, and again the nature and the person of the man as perfect and complete. If, on the other hand, we have regard to the union (*συνάφεια*), we say it is one Person."² The very illustration of the union of man and wife shows that Theodore did not suppose a *true* union of the two natures in Christ, but that his notion was rather that of an *external* connection of the two. The expression *συνάφεια*, moreover, which he selected here, instead of the term *ἔνωσις*, which he elsewhere employs, being derived from *συνάπτω* [to join together³], expresses only an external connection, a fixing together, and is therefore expressly rejected in later times by the doctors of the Church. And again, Theodore designates a merely external connection also in the phrase already quoted, to the effect that "the Logos dwells in the man assumed as in a temple." As a temple and the statue set up within it are one whole merely in outward appearance, so the Godhead and manhood in Christ appear only from without in their actuality as one Person, while they remain essentially two Persons.

To be consistent, Theodore was forced to regard also as

¹ Dorner, *l.c.* S. 52, and § 19 in Hardouin and Mansi, *ll. cc.*

² Hardouin and Mansi, *ll. cc.* § 29; Dorner, *l.c.* p. 52.

³ [It is used of dancers joining hand in hand.]

inadmissible the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* which had practically found acceptance in the Church. This doctrine, as is well known, is predicating the same properties of the two natures in Christ, not *in abstracto* (Godhead and manhood), but *in concreto* (God and man). Christ Himself had declared in S. John iii. 16: "God . . . gave His only begotten Son" (namely, to death), and similarly S. Peter declared (Acts iii. 15): "Ye . . . killed the Prince of Life," when in fact the being given up and being killed is a property (*ιδίωμα* = Predicate) of *man*, not of *God* (the only begotten, the Prince of Life).¹ In the same way Clement of Rome, for example, spoke of *παθήματα Θεοῦ* (1 *Ad Cor.* 2), Ignatius of Antioch (*Ad Ephes.* c. 1, and *Ad Rom.* 6) of an *αἷμα* and *πάθος Θεοῦ*, Tatian of a *Θεὸς πεπονθὼς* (*Ad Græcos*, c. 13); Barnabas teaches (c. 7) that "the Son of God could not suffer except on our behalf . . . and on our behalf He has brought the vessel of His Spirit as a sacrifice." Similarly Irenæus (iii. 16, 6) says, "The Logos *unigenitus impassibilis* has become *passibilis*;" and Athanasius, *ἐσταυρώμενον εἶναι Θεὸν* (*Ep. ad Epictet.* n. 10, t. i. P. ii. p. 726, ed Patav.). Specially cherished was the expression "God-bearer" (*θεοτόκος* = *Deipara*), and we find it more than a hundred years before the outbreak of the christological conflict in the writings of Origen, of Alexander of Alexandria, and of Athanasius.²

It is, however, to be remarked that the properties of the one nature were never transferred to the other nature *in itself*, but always to the *Person*, who is at the same time both man and God. Human attributes were not ascribed to the *Godhead*, but to *God*, and *vice versa*. They did not say, "the Godhead suffered," but "God suffered," and so forth. The ground of this *communicatio idiomatum* lies in the *unio hypostatica* of the two natures, whereby the Godhead and manhood in Christ are united in the one divine Person of the Logos; and long before the introduction of the expression *unio hypostatica*, the

¹ Origen expressed himself with remarkable beauty in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* on the *Communicatio idiomatum*: *Per indissolubilem unitatem Verbi et carnis, omnia quæ carnis sunt, adscribuntur et Verbo, et quæ Verbi sunt, prædicantur de carne.*

² Compare above, vol. i. p. 252. Also Münscher, *Lehrb.* i. S. 286; Socrates, vii. 32.

ancient fathers felt the truth set forth in it, when they endeavoured, although still inadequately, to give the ground of the *communicatio*. Thus Gregory of Nyssa remarks: "So long as the divine and human in Christ are regarded, each by itself, the properties (*ιδιώματα*) of both remain unmixed, but after the union (mixing, *ἀνακραθεῖσα*) the flesh (the human nature) participates in the glory of the Logos, in the power of the Godhead."¹ Still better Epiphanius writes: "If God suffered in the flesh, it was not His Godhead (in itself) which suffered; but what He suffered in the flesh which was borne by the Godhead, has relation also to the Godhead. It is just as when one has on a garment. If this garment is spotted with a drop of blood, we then say that the man is spotted with blood, although the spot has fallen only on the garment, and not on the man."²

Even Theodore of Mopsuestia, in his time, considered himself bound especially to oppose the expression "God-bearer." "Mary," he says, "bare Jesus, not the Logos, for the Logos was and remained omnipresent, although from the beginning He dwelt in Jesus in a peculiar manner. Thus Mary is properly the Christ-bearer, not the God-bearer. Only figuratively, *per anaphoram*, can she be called God-bearer also, because God was in Christ in a remarkable manner. Properly she bare a man, in whom the union with the Logos was begun, but was still so little completed, that He was not yet (but only from the time of His baptism) called the Son of God." And in another passage he remarks: "It is madness to say that God is born of the Virgin, . . . not God, but the temple in which God dwelt, is born of Mary."³

SEC. 128. *Nestorius.*

From the school of Theodore came Nestorius, with whose name the first period of the great christological controversy is

¹ Gregor. Nyss. *Contra Eunomium*, i. iv. t. ii. p. 161, ed. Paris, 1615; Münscher, *Lehrb. der Dogmeng.* i. 276.

² Epiph. *Ancorat.* c. 36 and 95, t. ii. pp. 42 and 96, ed. Patav. Similarly *Heres.* 69, n. 24 and 42; and *Heres.* 72, n. 23.

³ Hardouin and Mansi, *U. cc.* § i.; Dorner, *l. c.* S. 50.

connected.¹ Born at Germanicia, a city of Syria, Nestorius came to Antioch at an early age, chiefly for the purpose of obtaining a more liberal secular education. He soon distinguished himself by great facility in extempore speaking in union with a beautiful and powerful voice, and shortly afterwards entered the monastery of Euprepus at Antioch, and was thence appointed as deacon and afterwards as priest in the Cathedral of Antioch. As priest he preached very frequently and with remarkable acceptance, while he also enjoyed the reputation of being a rigid Ascetic, and repeatedly showed great zeal for orthodoxy, so that he was the first who publicly impugned an erroneous statement which Theodore of Mopsuestia had brought forward in the pulpit. But with all his activity he showed, as Theodore and others affirm, great vanity and a desire for the applause of the multitude, particularly in his sermons.² In consequence of the fame which he acquired, after the death of Bishop Sisinnius of Constantinople (Dec. 24, 427), he was raised to this famous throne; and his people hoped that in him they had obtained a second Chrysostom from Antioch. From the time of his ordination (April 10, 428) he showed great fondness for the work of preaching, and much zeal against heretics. In his very first sermon he addressed the Emperor Theodosius the younger with the words: "Give me, O Emperor, the earth cleansed from heretics, and I will for that give thee heaven; help me to make war against heretics, and I will help thee in the war against the Persians."³ A few days afterwards he determined to deprive the Arians of the chapel which they still possessed in Constantinople, so that they were led themselves to set fire to it, on which account Nestorius received from the heretics and from many of the orthodox the nickname of the Incendiary. Besides this he also attacked the Novatians, Quartodecimans, and Macedonians, and obtained

¹ It is not absolutely certain that Theodore of Mopsuestia was the teacher of Nestorius, but it is highly probable, as Petavius (*Dogm. Theolog.* t. iv. lib. i. c. 7) and Walch (*Ketzerhist.* Thl. v. S. 315 ff.) have shown.

² Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 29; Theodoret, *Haret. Fabul.* lib. iv. c. 12; Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 7; Gemad. *De Scrip. eccl.* c. 53; Vincent. *Lirin.* c. 16.

³ Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 29.

from the Emperor several stringent laws against the heretics (*ibid.* c. 31). The Pelagians alone found favour with him, since he seems to have regarded as correct their doctrine of the sufficiency of man's free will for the accomplishment of what is good; but not their view on original sin. He received Julius, Bishop of Eclanum, Cœlestius, and other exiled leaders of the Pelagians, and interceded for them, in the year 429, with the Emperor and also with Pope Cœlestine.¹ The Western layman, Marius Mercator, however, who at that time resided in Constantinople, made the Emperor acquainted, through a memorial (*Commonitorium*) still extant, with the true state of affairs, and with the fact that the Pelagians had already been condemned by Western Synods and Popes;² whereupon Theodosius commanded them to leave the capital.³ The sympathy which Nestorius had with them is shown by his letter to Cœlestius, the well-known friend of Pelagius, in which he bestows upon him the highest titles of honour, and compares him with John the Baptist, with Peter, and with Paul, as the object of unrighteous persecution.⁴

It was during these transactions in connection with the Pelagians that the other controversy began through which Nestorius has so sadly immortalized his name, and he refers to it in the first letter which he wrote to Pope Cœlestine on the Pelagian question.⁵ In another letter to John, Bishop of Antioch, Nestorius asserts that at the time of his arrival in Constantinople he had found a controversy already existing, in which one party designated the holy Virgin by the name of "God-bearer," the other as only "man-bearer." In order to mediate between them, he said, he had suggested the expression "Christ-bearer," in the conviction that both parties would be contented with it, since Christ was at the same time God and man.⁶ On the other hand, Socrates relates (vii. 32) that "the priest Anastasius, a friend of Nestorius, whom he brought to Constanti-

¹ Marius Mercator, ed Garnier, republ. by Migne, Paris, 1846, pp. 61, 174, 179, 181, 185, 187, 203 (note).

² In his *Works*, ed. Garnier-Migne, p. 63 sqq.

³ This is clear from the title of the memorial.

⁴ In Marius Merc. *l.c.* p. 182.

⁵ *Ibid.* *l.c.* p. 176.

⁶ In Mansi, t. v. p. 573; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1331.

nople with him, one day warned his hearers, in a sermon, that no one should call Mary the God-bearer (*θεοτόκος*), for Mary was a human being, and God could not be born of a human being.¹ This attack on a hitherto accepted ecclesiastical term and ancient belief caused great excitement and disturbance among clergy and laity, and Nestorius himself came forward and defended the discourse of his friend in several sermons. One party agreed with him, another opposed him, and many went so far as to accuse him, but evidently with injustice, of the error of Paul of Samosata, as if he acknowledged in Christ only a man."²

According to this account of the matter, Nestorius did not find the controversy already existing in Constantinople, but, along with his friend Anastasius, was the first to excite it. The sermons, however, which, as we have stated, he delivered on this subject, are still partially preserved for us, and are fully sufficient to disprove the inaccurate assertion of many, that Nestorius in fact taught nothing of a heterodox character. In his very first discourse he exclaims pathetically: "They ask whether Mary may be called *God-bearer*. But has God, then, a mother? In that case we must excuse heathenism, which spoke of mothers of the gods; but Paul is no liar when he said of the Godhead of Christ (Heb. vii. 3) that it is without father, without mother, and without genealogy. No, my friends, Mary did not bear God; . . . the creature did not bear the Creator, but the Man, who is the *Instrument* of the Godhead. The Holy Ghost did not place the Logos, but He provided for Him, from the blessed Virgin, a *temple* which He might inhabit. . . . This *garment* of which He makes use I honour for the sake of Him who is hidden within it, and is inseparable from it. . . . I separate the natures and unite the reverence. Consider what this means. He who was formed in the womb of Mary was not God Himself, but God

¹ According to Cyril of Alexandria (*Ep.* vi. p. 30, *Ep.* ix. p. 37, *Opp.* t. v. ed. Aubert.; and in Mansi, t. iv. p. 1014), the first attack on *θεοτόκος* was made by Bishop Dorotheus (apparently of Marcianople), a friend of Nestorius.

² Several Protestants lay stress upon the fact that Luther, in his time, had remarked upon the injustice of the last reproach. Quite true; but more than a thousand years before, Socrates (vii. 32), in the very place where he mentions the accusation, asserts its groundlessness.

assumed Him (*assumsit*, that is, clothed Himself with humanity) and, because of Him who assumes, He who is assumed is also named *God*.”¹

The second homily opens with a bitter reproach against his predecessors, as though they had not had time to lead the people to the deeper knowledge of God. Thereupon he turns again to his main theme, that Christ is double in nature and single in dignity. “When,” he says, “the Holy Scripture speaks of the birth of Christ, or of His death, then it never calls Him *God*, but *Christ*, or *Jesus*, or *Lord*, designations which apply to both natures. . . . Mary may then be called *Χριστοτόκος*, and she bore the *Son of God* inasmuch as she bore the man who, by reason of his union with the Son of God (in the proper sense), may also be called Son of God (in the wider sense). In the same way, it may be said that the *Son* of God died, but not that *God* died. . . . We will, then, hold fast the union of the natures without confusion, and in the man we will acknowledge God, and will reverence the man who, by a kind of divine union with God, is at the same time to be worshipped.”²

In the third discourse he says: “The Arians place the Logos only below the Father, but these people (who teach the *θεοτόκος* and speak of a *birth of God*) place Him below even Mary, assert that He is more recent than she, and give to the Godhead which created all a temporal mother as origin. If He whom she bore was not man, but God the Logos, then she was not the mother of Him who was born, for how could she be the mother of Him who is of a different nature from herself? But if she is to be called His mother, then He who is born is not of divine nature, but a man, since every mother can bear only that which is of like substance with herself. God the Logos, then, was not born of Mary, but He dwelt in Him who was born of Mary.”

It is easy to see that Nestorius occupied the point of view of his teacher Theodore of Mopsuestia, and was even less inclined than he to set aside the duality of the persons in Christ otherwise than in appearance. Several of his priests gave him

¹ In Marius Mercat. ed. Garnier-Migne, p. 757 sqq.

² Marius Merc. l.c. 763 sqq.

notice of withdrawal from his communion, and preached against him. The people cried out, "We have an Emperor, but not a Bishop." Some, and among them laymen, spoke against him even in public when he preached, and particularly a certain Eusebius, undoubtedly the same who was subsequently Bishop of Dorylæum, who, although at the time still a layman, was among the first who saw through and opposed the new heresy. Nestorius applied to him and others, for this reason, the epithet of "miserable men,"¹ called in the police against them, and had them flogged and imprisoned, particularly several monks, whose accusation addressed to the Emperor against him has come down to our times.²

It was in a more careful way that *Proclus*, Bishop of Cyzicus, stepped into the lists. He had formerly been a priest of Constantinople, and was appointed by the late Patriarch Sisinnius as Bishop of Cyzicus. But the inhabitants of that city would not accept him, and therefore he continued to live in Constantinople. Invited by Nestorius to preach at one of the festivals of the Virgin (429), he made use of the opportunity to describe, in his presence, the honour and dignity of Mary as *God-bearer* in many rhetorical phrases drawn from the Bible, and to defend the expression which had been called in question in a clever but, at the same time, rather a pompous manner.³ Nestorius thus found it necessary at once to deliver a second sermon, in order, as he said, to warn those who were present against an excessive veneration of Mary, and against the opinion that the Word of God (the Logos) could be born twice (once eternally from the Father, and a second time of Mary). He who says simply that God is born of Mary makes the Christian dogma ridiculous to the heathen . . . for the heathen will reply, "I cannot worship a God who is born, dies, and is buried." It is evident that what is born is the human nature, but the Godhead is united with it. . . . He entirely agreed, therefore, with the previous speaker, when he said that "He who

¹ Marius Merc. *l.c.* p. 770; Cyrill. *Opp.* t. iv. p. 20; Tillemont, t. xiv. p. 313.

² In Hardouin, t. i. p. 1336; Mansi, t. iv. p. 1102.

³ His discourse is given in a Latin translation by Marius Mercator, *l.c.* p. 775 sqq.; in Greek by Mansi, t. iv. p. 578 sqq. Hardouin has not given it. On Proclus, cf. Assemani, *Biblioth. jur. orient.* t. iii. p. 42 sqq.

was born of woman is not pure God and not mere man, for the manhood which is born is united with the Godhead." . . . Is the Logos risen from the dead? And if the life-giver (Logos) died, who then could give life? The mystery of godliness must, however, be expressed in this manner: "One thing is the Logos who dwelt in the temple formed by the Holy Ghost, and another is this temple itself, different from the God who dwells within it." He acknowledged, then, the unity of the combination, but the duality of the natures and substances. . . . In short, it was an absurd accusation to charge him with teaching the error of Photinus; on the contrary, that which he asserted overthrew the doctrine of Photinus.¹

In a second discourse, delivered afterwards against Proclus, he explained that he could allow the expression *θεοτόκος* if it were rightly understood, but that he was forced to oppose it because both the Arians and the Apollinarians sheltered themselves behind it. If they did not sufficiently distinguish the two natures, an Arian might take all these scripture texts which referred to the *ταπείνωσις* of Christ as man, *e.g.* His not knowing and the like, and transfer them to the divine nature, so as to prove from them the theory of subordinationism. Nestorius further attributes to those who make use of the *θεοτόκος* the view that, in their opinion, the Godhead first had its beginning through Mary, which certainly none had asserted; and in order to avoid this notion, he proposes, instead of the expression "God was born of Mary," to allow this, "God passed (*transiit*) through Mary."²

The fragment of another sermon³ is directed entirely against the *communicatio idiomatum*, particularly against the expression, "the Logos suffered;" but still more important is the fourth discourse against Proclus, containing these words:—"The life-giving Godhead they call mortal, and dare to draw down the Logos to the level of the fables of the theatre, as though He (as a child) was wrapped in swaddling-clothes and afterwards died. . . . Pilate did not kill the Godhead, but the garment of the Godhead; and it was not the Logos which was wrapped in a linen cloth by Joseph of Arimathea and buried. . . . He did not die who gives life, for who would then

¹ In Marius Mercator, *l.c.* p. 782.

² *Ibid.* p. 785.

³ *Ibid.* p. 787.

raise Him who died? . . . God was not altered through His union or communion with man, but, united with human nature and clasping it in His embrace (*complexibus stringens*), He raised it up to heaven, while He Himself remained unchanged. . . . In order to make satisfaction for men, Christ assumed the person of the guilty nature (of humanity) (*debetis suscepit personam naturæ*). . . . Christ is not mere man, but God and man at the same time. . . . And this man I worship along with the Godhead as the *cooperarius divinæ auctoritatis*, as the *instrumentum* of the goodness of the Lord, . . . as the living purple garment of the King, . . . *separo naturas, sed conjungo reverentiam*. That which was formed in the womb of Mary is not God Himself . . . but because God dwells in Him whom He has assumed, therefore also He who is assumed is called God because of Him who assumes Him. And it is not God who has suffered, but God was united with the crucified flesh. . . . We will therefore call the holy Virgin *θεοδόχος*, but not *θεοτόκος*, for only God the Father is *θεοτόκος*; but we will honour that nature which is the garment of God along with Him who makes use of this garment, we will separate the natures and unite the honour, we will acknowledge a double person and worship it as *one*.¹

We can see from all this, that Nestorius

(α) Properly determined to hold fast the duality of the two natures and the integrity of each; that he

(β) Was in a position, with his teaching, to reject the theories alike of the Arians and Apollinarians; that he

(γ) Says, with perfect right, that the Godhead in itself can neither be born nor suffer; also,

(δ) That the notion of the *θεοτόκος*, which he persistently opposes, which would assume that the Godhead in itself had been born, and could have its beginning of Mary, was certainly worse than heretical.

(ε) Further, we see that in a certain sense he would allow even the expression *θεοτόκος*; but

(ξ) As often as he makes the attempt to hit the truth, he is again turned aside by his fear of the *communicatio idiomatum*. This fear pursues him like a spectre, and in fact for

¹ In Marius Merc. l.c. pp. 789-801.

this reason, that, instead of uniting the human *nature* with the divine *person*, he always assumes the union of a human *person* with the Godhead. Embarrassed by the concrete notion of a man, he can never rise to the abstract idea, nor think of human nature without personality, nor gain an idea of the union of the merely human *nature* with the divine *person*. Therefore he says quite decidedly, Christ has assumed the *person* of guilty humanity, and he can unite the Godhead and manhood in Christ only *externally*, because he regards the latter as a person, as is shown by all the figures and similes which he employs. The Godhead *dwells* only, as he says, in the manhood, the latter is only a *temple*, only a *garment* of the Godhead, and the latter was not born of Mary at the same time with the former, but only passed through Mary; it did not suffer along with the humanity, but it remained impassible in the suffering man, that which evidently would be possible only if the humanity had a centre and a special personality of its own. If, however, the personal in Christ was His Godhead, and this alone, then, if Christ suffered, the Godhead must also have entered into His suffering, and the human nature could not suffer alone, because it had no proper personal subsistence. So also only one *Person* could be *born* of Mary; and because the personal in Christ was only His Godhead, this must also have participated in the birth, although *in itself* it is as little capable of being born as of suffering.

SEC. 129. *The Conflict between Cyril and Nestorius begins.*

It was not long before the Nestorian views spread from Constantinople to other provinces, and so early as in the year 429 Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, found it necessary in an Easter sermon to give clear and plain expression to the orthodox doctrine, without, however, mentioning Nestorius and the events which had occurred at Constantinople, declaring that not the *Godhead* (in itself), but the Logos which was united with the human nature, was born of Mary.¹

There had been a special attempt made to extend Nesto-

¹ Cyrill. Alex. *Opp.* t. v. p. ii. p. 222.

rianism among the numerous monks of Egypt, and emissaries sent for the purpose had been active in this effort. Cyril considered it, therefore, his duty to put them on their guard at once, especially as many of them had no theological education; and if once they had been laid hold of by the error, they would of necessity have been most dangerous, on account of their huge number and their great influence upon the people. In a very complete doctrinal letter to his monks, he now shows¹ how even the great Athanasius had used the expression "God-bearer," and that both Holy Scripture and the Synod of Nicæa taught the close union of the two natures in Christ. The mystery of the Incarnation of God had a certain analogy with the birth of every human being. As the body *and* the soul of the child are born at the same time of a woman, although properly the soul *in itself* cannot be born, so also the divine Logos was born along with the human nature.² The Logos *in Himself* cannot properly be called Christ (c. 18); but neither must we call Christ a *homo deifer* (θεοφόρος), who has assumed humanity as an instrument, but He must be called "God truly made man" (c. 19).

The body of Christ is not the body of any other, but of the Word (c. 20); *i.e.*, the human nature of Christ does not belong to any human *person*, but the personality to which it belongs is the Logos. (In this way Nestorianism was struck on the head.) Were the humanity of Christ, he proceeded, a mere *instrumentum* of the Godhead, then Christ would not be essentially different from Moses, for he, too, was an instrument of God (c. 21). At the close he further compares the death of Christ with our death. In our case, he says, it is properly only the body which dies, and yet we say "the man dies" (that is, the soul *in itself* does not die, but it participates in the suffering and death of the body). So it is with Christ. The Godhead in itself did not die, but the Logos has what in the first place belonged to His human nature, *velut proprium in se transtulit*; and thus we can say, "He suffered death" (c. 24). As man He suffered death,

¹ *Opp. l.c. Epist. i. pp. 1-19*; also in Mansi, t. iv. pp. 587-618. It is not given by Hardouin.

² *Ibid. c. 12, p. 599*; in Mansi, *l.c.*

as God He again abolished death; and He could not have wrought out our salvation by His divine nature if He had not endured death for our sake in His human nature (c. 25).

This treatise of Cyril was also brought to Constantinople, and excited Nestorius to employ violent expressions respecting his Alexandrian colleague. The latter therefore directed a short letter to Nestorius, in which he said, "that it was not he (Cyril) and his treatise, but Nestorius or his friend who was the cause of the present prevailing ecclesiastical disorder. It had even gone so far already, that some would no longer call Christ *God*, but only instrument of God and a God-bearing man. At such a violation of the faith, it had not been possible for him to keep silence, and Nestorius could himself say what he would have to answer the Roman bishop Cœlestine and other bishops, who asked him whether Nestorius had really written and said the things which were currently reported of him. Besides, there came from all the provinces of the East unfavourable reports concerning Nestorius, and he should therefore pacify again all who had taken offence from the use of the expression *θεοτόκος*." ¹

Nestorius answered this in a few lines, which contained hardly anything but self-praise and insolence, to the effect that "Christian love and the urgency of the Alexandrian priest Lampo alone had induced him to give an answer to Cyril, whose letter contained much that was at variance with brotherly love. He greeted all the brethren who were with Cyril." ²

About the same time Nestorius availed himself of an opportunity of endeavouring, if possible, to gain over Pope Cœlestine to himself and his teaching. He wrote to him that some Western bishops—namely, the Pelagian Julian, Florus, Oron-tius, and Fabius—had complained to the Emperor and to him that, although orthodox, they were persecuted. They had been several times sent away, but they had always renewed their complaints, and he would now ask for more exact information respecting their case. Moreover, he said,

¹ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 883 sq.; and in the *Works* of Cyril, *l.c.* *Epist.* ii. p. 19 sq. It is wanting in Hardouin.

² Cyrill. *Opp. l.c. Ep.* iii. p. 21; and in Mansi, *l.c.* p. 886.

he had wished to destroy a heretical disease which prevailed in his diocese, and even among the clergy, which was akin to the corruption of Apollinarianism and Arianism. These heretics mingled the Godhead and manhood in Christ, and blasphemously alleged that the Word of God had, as it were, taken a beginning from the *Christ-bearer*; that He was built up along with His temple (the humanity), and was buried along with the flesh (humanity); and that, after the resurrection, the flesh (humanity) had passed over into the Godhead. They ventured, therefore, to call the Virgin *God-bearer*, whilst neither the Fathers at Nicæa nor the Holy Scriptures had employed this expression. Such an expression was not in fact admissible, and could be tolerated only with a certain explanation (that Mary had borne only a man, but that with this the Godhead was inseparably united). Cœlestine had probably already heard what struggles he (Nestorius) had to maintain against these false teachers; but he had not struggled in vain, for many had been happily converted.¹

A second and somewhat later epistle explains to the Pope, that Nestorius had long waited for an answer with reference to those Western (Pelagian) bishops, and requests that Cœlestine would at last let him have more accurate information concerning them. At the same time he speaks again of the new heresy, which renews Apollinarianism and Arianism.²

The state of tension which had arisen between Cyril and Nestorius had induced some Alexandrians, who had been punished by Cyril on account of gross moral excesses, now to go to Constantinople, and there to bring forward complaints against their archbishop. One of these complainants had been guilty of dishonesty as a reliever of the poor, the second had shockingly ill-treated his mother, the third had stolen; and Nestorius had granted these people a hearing. Cyril now complains of this in a fresh letter to Nestorius, and joins with it, as the principal thing, a request that Nestorius will

¹ Given in Latin by Marius Merc. *l.c.* p. 174; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1307; Mansi, *l.c.* p. 1021. In Germany by Fuchs, *Biblioth. der Kirchenvers.* Bd. iii. S. 503.

² In Marius Merc. *l.c.* p. 178; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1309; Mansi, *l.c.* p. 1023; in German by Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 507.

redress the grievance which he has occasioned by his sermons. At the same time, he briefly defines the orthodox doctrine, to the effect that the Word did not become flesh in such a manner as that God's nature had changed or been transformed into *σὰρξ* and *ψυχή*; on the contrary, the Logos had hypothetically united with Himself the *σὰρξ*, animated by the *ψυχὴ λογικὴ*, and thus had, in an inexplicable manner, become man. . . . *The two distinct natures had been united into a true unity (πρὸς ἐνότητα τὴν ἀληθινὴν συναχθεῖσαι φύσεις), from both one [not double] Christ and one Son had come, not as though the difference of the natures had been done away by the union, but, on the contrary, that they constituted the one Lord Jesus Christ and Son by the unutterable union of the Godhead and the manhood.* He then rejects the unjust reproach of Nestorius, who represented that Cyril and his friends taught that the Logos had first received His beginning from Mary (this was a false inference which Nestorius deduced from the expression *θεοτόκος*), and he proceeds: "It is not that a man was born of Mary upon whom the Logos then descended, but the Logos united Himself with the human nature in the womb of Mary, and thus was, after the flesh, born. So also He suffered, etc., since the Logos, who is in Himself impassible, endured this in the body which He had assumed."¹

Nestorius replied that "he would pass in silence the insults which were contained in this astonishing production of Cyril's, but on another point he would not be silent. Cyril appealed to the Creed of Nicæa, but he had certainly read it only superficially, and his ignorance therefore deserved excuse." He would now show him from this Creed, and from Holy Scripture, that we ought not to say that God was born and suffered, and that Mary was the God-bearer; that was heathenish, Apollinarian, Arian. Cyril had certainly said rightly, that two natures were united in one person, and that the Godhead in itself could neither be born nor suffer; but what he added afterwards, as to how far the Godhead of Christ entered into the suffering, etc., entirely did away with what was said before.

¹ Cyrilli *Opp. l.c. Epist. iv. p. 22*; in Mansi, *l.c. p. 887 sqq.*, and t. iv. p. 659; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1273, and t. ii. p. 115; in German by Fuchs, *l.c. S. 479 ff.*

At the close Nestorius remarks, in a harsh and scornful tone: "That Cyril was so zealous for the cause of God, and so anxious for the Church of Constantinople, but he had been deceived by clergy of his own stamp (τῆς οἱς ἰσως διαθέσεως), who had been deposed at Constantinople on account of Manichæism. At Constantinople itself everything was in an excellent condition, and the Emperor was quite in agreement with the doctrine."¹

While the correspondence of Cyril with Nestorius himself led to no result, the former found it necessary, particularly on account of the last remark of Nestorius, also to apply to the Emperor and to address two letters to the imperial ladies (ταῖς βασιλίσσαις), Eudocia (the wife of the Emperor) and Pulcheria (the Emperor's sister), and, without mentioning the name of Nestorius, to explain to them the true doctrine by passages from Holy Scripture and the Fathers, in a very complete manner.² That Cyril should apply to the Emperor will astonish no one, but even his doctrinal letter to the two princesses finds its explanation and justification in the then existing condition of the Byzantine Court. After the death of his father Arcadius, in the year 408, Theodosius the younger became Emperor at the age of from seven to eight years. He was and remained kindly and pious all his life long; but far more talent than belonged to him was shown by his sister Pulcheria, who was only a few years older than himself, to whom the Senate, on account of her remarkable prudence, in A.D. 414, when she numbered only sixteen years, gave the title of Augusta, and confided to her the administration of the Empire together with the guardianship of her brother. She married the latter in the year 421 to Eudocia, the intellectual and amiable daughter of a heathen philosopher of Athens, whom she had herself gained over to Christianity, and whom she had regarded as worthy of the throne; and both these excellent women took so great an interest in all ecclesiastical and political occurrences, and were so highly educated and of so great influence, that Cyril had

¹ Cyrilli *Opp. l.c. Epist. v. p. 25.* In Hardouin, t. i. p. 1277, and Mansi, t. iv. p. 891 sqq. In German by Fuchs, *l.c. S. 489.*

² These two letters are preserved in Cyrilli *Opp. l.c.*, and in Mansi, t. iv. pp. 618-679, 679-803, and 803-883. They are wanting in Hardouin.

every reason for laying the great theological question as distinctly as possible before them. So also he applied to several Greek and Oriental bishops, particularly to the venerable Acacius, Bishop of Berrhœa, who was nearly a hundred years of age, in order to make them thoroughly acquainted with the whole controversy, and to gain them for the orthodox side.¹ Acacius answered in a friendly spirit, lamented the controversy, and counselled peace.² The Emperor Theodosius, on the other hand, allowed himself to be prejudiced by Nestorius against Cyril, and blamed the latter for having begun the quarrel, particularly for having addressed the imperial ladies in a special letter, as if they were not in agreement with the Emperor on this question, or perhaps even to sow discord in the imperial family.³ We may, with much probability, infer from these last words, and also from what happened, especially through Pulcheria, after the death of Theodosius, that the two princesses had expressed themselves in opposition to the Emperor, on behalf of Cyril and against Nestorius.

Long before this imperial letter was despatched, Cyril addressed a letter also to those Alexandrian clergy who attended to his interests at Constantinople, and explained to them, too, the true doctrine on the controverted point, as well as the deceptive statements and false accusations of the Nestorians. At the same time, he continued, he would not yet, as they advised, come forward with a formal complaint against Nestorius, whilst he certainly could not at all acknowledge him as his judge, and he asked them, when it became necessary, to transmit the enclosed explanation to the Emperor.⁴ Cyril then pointed out that Nestorius had laid under anathema all who made use of the expression "God-bearer,"⁵ and had threatened to bring before a Synod the charges against Cyril conveyed to him by some Alexandrians,⁶ and to have him

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 517.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 518.

³ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1110; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1341.

⁴ Best in the Latin translation in Marius Merc. *l.c.* p. 808 sqq., and Mansi, t. v. p. 722; less accurate in Greek, in Mansi, t. iv. p. 1003 sqq. In German in Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 495.

⁵ This is clear from the letter of Cyril to Acacius of Berrhœa, in Mansi, t. v. p. 517.

⁶ Cf. the third letter of Nestorius to Pope Celestine, in Mansi, t. v. See note in § 130.

deposed, as he had already done with others who revered the expression *θεοτόκος*.¹ For this reason, and also because Nestorius himself had first applied to Rome in regard to the question of *θεοτόκος*, and, on the other hand, the Pope also had made inquiries on the subject of Cyril, the latter had felt bound to inform the Pope on the subject of the new heresy, and he did this in a letter, in which he said: "It would be more agreeable if we could keep silence, but God demands of us watchfulness, and ecclesiastical custom requires me to inform your holiness. I have hitherto observed profound silence, and have written neither to you nor to any other Bishop on what has been passing in Constantinople, because haste in such a case is a fault; but now that the evil has reached its culminating-point, I believe myself bound to speak and to explain all that has occurred." He then relates how the whole controversy arose in Constantinople, and how he has warned Nestorius several times, and is for this reason persecuted by him. Nearly all the Eastern bishops are in accord with Cyril, especially the Macedonian bishops; but Nestorius considers himself wiser than all, and believes that he alone understands the divine mysteries. He (Cyril) had not wished to threaten him with excommunication before he had given the Pope notice of it, and the latter may now decide what is to be done, and give instructions on that point to the Eastern and Macedonian bishops.²

Along with this he sent the Deacon Possidonius to Rome, and gave him at the same time translations of all the other letters written hitherto by Cyril on the Nestorian question, as well as a special memorial in which he had drawn out in short propositions the Nestorian error, and the orthodox doctrine opposed to it. He particularly says in it that Nestorius avoids the expression *ένωσις*, and speaks only of a *συνάφεια* of the two natures.³ Possidonius was further commissioned to give the documents in question to the Pope only

¹ Cf. the letter of the Pope to Nestorius, etc. p. 25.

² Cyrilli *Opp. l.c. Epist.* ix. p. 36. In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1011 sqq. In German by Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 508 ff. Hardouin has not given this document.

³ In Hardouin, t. i. p. 1319; Mansi, t. iv. p. 547. In German, by Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 516.

when he learnt that Nestorius had already appealed to the Pope.¹

SEC. 130. *Synod at Rome, A.D. 430, and the Transactions connected with it.*

In consequence of this, Pope Cœlestine, in the year 430, held a Synod at Rome, at which Nestorius was declared a heretic, and threatened with deposition, unless he revoked his errors within ten days of the reception of this decision. We have still the fragment of a speech made by the Pope at the Synod, in which he approves of the expression *θεοτόκος*,² as well as the four letters which he despatched, as the result of the Synod, to Nestorius, to his Church, to Cyril, and to John of Antioch, all dated the 11th of August 430.³

In the first of these, to Nestorius, in which he uses very sharp language, the Pope complains that now, alas! the good reputation formerly enjoyed by Nestorius has entirely vanished. The Pope had not hitherto answered his letters, because it was necessary that they should first be translated into Latin; but in the meantime very bad news respecting him had been received from Cyril. Nestorius had paid no regard to two warnings from Cyril; if he now refused to obey this third admonition, then he must be shut out from the Catholic Christian Church. It is no wonder to the Pope that Nestorius protects the Pelagians, since he is much worse than they. It is to be hoped, however, that he will not destroy the unity of the Church, and that in token of his improvement he will recall all those whom, for Christ's sake (that is, on account of their orthodoxy), he has expelled from the Church. If he does not condemn his impious innovation within ten days, he must be expelled from all communion with the orthodox Church, and Cyril has to publish this judgment, as representative of the Pope.⁴

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1130; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1355.

² In Mansi, t. iv. p. 550 (wanting in Hardouin).

³ In Mansi, t. iv. pp. 1017, 1025, 1035, and 1047; Hardouin, t. i. pp. 1299, 1311, 1321, 1323. Cf. Garnier's treatise, *De Synodis habitis in causa Nestoriana*, in his edition of the works of Marius Mercator (ed. Migne, p. 1167 sqq.). Garnier here, as frequently, makes two synods out of one.

⁴ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1025; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1299. In German by Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 531.

To nearly the same effect is the second letter of the Pope, addressed to the clergy and laity of Constantinople, in which he exhorts them all to steadfastness and fidelity in the faith, and to endurance, if they are persecuted by Nestorius; for all whom the latter has smitten, or shall hereafter smite, with excommunication or deposition, on account of their adherence to orthodoxy, are and remain in communion with the Pope. In conclusion, he informs them that he has delegated to Cyril to give effect to the sentence against Nestorius.¹

Substantially the same statements were contained in those letters which Cœlestine addressed to the most distinguished Eastern and Macedonian Bishops, so as to inform them of the error of Nestorius, and of the sentence which had just been pronounced against him. These were John, Bishop of Antioch, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Rufus of Thessalonica, and Flavian of Philippi. Of these letters, the one addressed to John of Antioch is no longer extant,² but they all seem to have been to the same effect. It is very probable that the Pope sent at least the two letters destined for Asia first to Alexandria, for greater certainty, on which account Cyril on his part contributed a companion letter, and from these the two addressed to Juvenal and John have come down to us. Cyril in these letters endeavoured to justify his previous conduct in this matter, and to induce his colleagues to recognize the Roman decision.³

More important for us is Cœlestine's letter to Cyril himself. In it he praises him in strong terms, approves of his teaching, sanctions all that he has done, and gives order that, in case Nestorius perseveres in his perverse opinion, and does not within ten days after the reception of the Papal letter condemn his impious doctrine, and promise to teach so as to be in accordance with the faith of the Roman and Alexandrian Churches, and in fact with the whole of Christendom, Cyril must carry into effect the judgment of the Roman Synod in

¹ Mansi, *l.c.* p. 1035; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1311. German by Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 541.

² In Mansi, *l.c.* p. 1047. Hardouin, t. i. p. 1323. German by Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 547.

³ In Mansi, t. iv. pp. 1049 and 1053.

the name of the Pope, with all energy, and give him notice of his exclusion from the Church.¹

It was probably before Nestorius had received intelligence of the sentence pronounced against him at Rome, but certainly while he was in fear of it, that he addressed his third letter to the Pope, in which he first makes the false statement that Cyril had begun the controversy respecting *θεοτόκος*, in order to avert the holding of a Synod at Constantinople, to consider the charges which had been brought against him to that city; whereas the first letters between Cyril and Nestorius, as has already been pointed out, referred to the controversy respecting *θεοτόκος*, and it was only those written somewhat later which mention those accusations (see pp. 20 and 23). Equally deceptive is the second assertion which Nestorius makes in this letter to the Pope, "that he has nothing against those who make use of the expression God-bearer, when it is not done in an Apollinarian and Arian sense," when in fact he had given a general approval of the anathema pronounced on this expression, and had excommunicated those members of his Church who made use of it. (See above, p. 25 f.) It is evident that he is ready to make certain concessions, and so to avert from himself the threatening storm; therefore he also proposes to select the middle way between the two parties, of which the one calls Mary "*God-bearer*," and the other "*Man-bearer*," by adopting the expression "*Christ-bearer*." Finally, he remarks that shortly by God's help an Œcumenical Council of the Church will take place and again restore ecclesiastical peace.²

John, Bishop of Antioch, was most anxious to bring about such a peace as soon as possible, even without a Synod. He had been in his youth a friend of Nestorius, and immediately after receiving the papal letter already mentioned he urged him to submission. The limit of ten days, he said, was certainly brief, but it needed only a few hours to give his approval to the expression *θεοτόκος*, which was quite applicable to the saving Incarnation and Birth of Christ, and had been used by many of

¹ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1017; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1321. In German by Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 528.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 725. In the Latin translation of Marius Mercator. In German by Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 526 (wanting in Hardouin).

the Fathers. Here, then, was no danger, and consequently no reason for hesitation, especially as Nestorius himself acknowledged that this expression had also a quite orthodox meaning. It was in fact perfectly accurate, and if it were rejected, then it would of necessity follow that He who had come into the world for us was not God. And certainly the Holy Scripture represented this as the most glorious operation of the grace of God, *that the eternal Son of God was born of the Virgin*; without the Logos having thereby suffered any unworthy change. Therefore Paul says (Gal. iv. 4): "God sent forth His Son, *born of a woman*." Nestorius ought then to accept the expression *θεοτόκος*; and this was not only his counsel, but also that of many other Eastern Bishops, of whom he particularly mentioned several.¹

Nestorius answered courteously but evasively, expressed a hope that the controversy might be discontinued, but at the same time gave no promise respecting *θεοτόκος*, and referred everything specially to the expected Œcumenical Synod.² From Rome, however, he had still received nothing, for Cyril, whose duty it was to transmit the sentence, first held another

SEC. 131. *Synod at Alexandria,*

in order to draw up or have sanctioned a formula of belief, which Nestorius should be required to accept, if the judgment pronounced against him at Rome was not to be put in force. The very comprehensive letter to Nestorius, prepared by Cyril and sanctioned by this Synod,³ begins with somewhat violent complaints of his heresy, which it was a sacred duty to resist. Then follows the announcement that Nestorius, in case he refuses to depart from his errors within the space of time allowed by Pope Cœlestine, shall be entirely excluded from the number of God's bishops and priests. It is not sufficient that he acknowledge the Creed of Nicæa, for he understands it in an erroneous and perverse manner, and therefore he *must add a written and sworn declaration*, that he moreover con-

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1061; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1327. German by Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 554.

² Mansi, t. v. p. 752; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1331. German by Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 561.

³ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1067; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1283. Merely in Latin, Mansi, v. p. 502 sqq. German, Fuchs, *l.c.* Bd. iii. S. 564 ff.

demns his (previous) pernicious and unholy assertions, and will in future believe and teach the same as Cyril, as the Synod, and the Bishops of the East and West. This orthodox doctrine is now explained in the following paper, and in the first place the Nicene Creed (without the additions of Constantinople, but along with the Anathema appended against Arianism) is verbally repeated. To this is added a doctrinal discussion of the point of doctrine in question, and it is said: "Following the Confessions of the Fathers, and thus also going along the *royal road* (βασιλικὴν ὥσπερ ἐρχόμενοι τρίβον), we explain that the only-begotten Logos of God . . . assumed flesh of the blessed Virgin, made it His own, subjected Himself to human birth, and came forth from the woman as Man, *without casting off that which He was*, but even in the flesh remaining the same, namely, *true God in His nature. And the flesh* (= human nature) *was not changed into the nature of the Godhead, nor the nature of the divine Logos into that of the flesh*, for it is subject to no change. But even as a child and in the mother's bosom, the Logos at the same time filled the whole world, and was Governor of it along with His Father, for the Godhead has no bounds and limits. If, however, the Logos is *hypostatically* united with the flesh, then we reverence only one Son and Lord Jesus Christ, and do not *sever* man and God, nor believe that *they are united* (συνάπτω) *only in dignity and power*:—these are new expressions. We do not teach two Christs, of whom the one was the true Logos of God, the other the true Son of the woman, but we know only one Christ, the divine Word, united with that which has become His own flesh (ἓνα μόνον εἰδότες Χριστὸν, τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς Λόγον μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκός). Moreover, we do not say that the divine Word dwelt in the man who was born of the holy Virgin, as in an ordinary man, and we do not call Christ a θεοφόρος ἄνθρωπος; for when we say that the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ (Col. ii. 9), we do not thereby mean such a dwelling as that of the Godhead in the *saints*, but that in Christ the Godhead united itself with the manhood κατὰ φύσιν,¹ just as in man the soul is united with the body.

¹ Cf. on this point, above, p. 3, and below, p. 31 f.

There is thus one Christ, one Son and Lord, and not merely by the *συνάφεια* with the divine dignity and power, by which different natures are not *united*. Peter and John had equal dignity, for both were apostles and both holy disciples, but yet they were not one Person. Moreover, the expression *συνάφεια* is not admissible, because it does not clearly indicate the *union*; nor can we properly say that the divine Logos is the *Lord of Christ*, since thereby we should again separate the one Lord and Christ. So also we should not say: I reverence Him who is borne (the human nature of Christ) on account of Him who bears Him, the visible on account of the invisible; or, He who is assumed is called God, together with Him who assumed Him; for in this way, too, would Christ be divided into a God and a man. On the contrary, we must conceive of Christ as One, and honour Him together with the flesh which has become His own. Further, we acknowledge that the only-begotten Son of God is, in His own nature, incapable of suffering, but that, for our sake, He suffered in the flesh, and was in the crucified body, and *being free from suffering, He appropriated to Himself the sufferings of His own flesh*" (*τὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς ἀπαθὼς οἰκειουμένης πάθη*), and so forth.

That this is the orthodox doctrine, the synodal letter afterwards shows very beautifully by reference to the eucharistic belief, thus: "This very fact, that we acknowledge that the only-begotten Son of God died in the flesh, rose, and ascended into heaven, qualifies us for offering the unbloody sacrifice in the Church, and, by participation in the holy flesh and precious blood of the Redeemer, for receiving the mystical blessing so as to be sanctified. We receive it not as common flesh, nor as the flesh of an eminently sanctified man, or of one who has received dignity by being united with the Logos or by the divine indwelling, but as the true life-giving and proper flesh of the Word. For since He as God is, in His own nature, life, and is become One with His own flesh, so has He imparted to this flesh a life-giving power." The Synod further explains a series of Scripture passages, to which Nestorius, like the Arians, had appealed. These are the passages of which one class ascribe full divine dignity to Christ, while another class express a limitation and the like.

If the Arians had endeavoured from the latter class to prove their theory of subordination, Nestorius, on the other hand, made use of both classes of texts to justify his division of Christ into a Son of man and a Son of God. The Synod, in opposition to this, shows how both classes of texts apply to one and the same Christ, and developes the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum*. When He speaks of Himself according to His Godhead, says the Synod, we refer this to His divine nature; and when He ascribes to Himself human imperfections, we refer these expressions also to the divine Logos, in so far as He has become man, and has voluntarily emptied Himself of His glory; as, for example, when Christ is called an *High Priest* and the like, or it is said of the Holy Ghost that He has *glorified* Christ. All such expressions must be assigned to one Person, the one incarnate Hypostasis (Personality) of the Logos. But since the holy Virgin bore, after the flesh, God hypostatically united with the flesh, we call her the *God-bearer*; yet not as though the nature of the Logos had first taken the beginning of its being from the flesh (the body of Mary), but because the Word, uniting the human hypostatically with Himself, subjected Himself to a fleshly birth from a human mother.

SEC. 132. *The Anathematisms of Cyril and the Counter-Anathematisms of Nestorius.*

At the close of their letter the Synod summed up the whole in the celebrated twelve anathematisms, composed by Cyril, with which Nestorius was required to agree. They are the following:—

1. "If any one does not confess that Emmanuel is true God, and that therefore the holy Virgin is God-bearer, since she bore, after the flesh, the incarnate Word of God, let him be anathema."

2. "If any one does not confess that the Logos from God the Father hypostatically united Himself with the flesh (= human nature), and with that which has become His own flesh is one Christ, God and man together, let him be anathema."

3. "If any one separates the hypostases (= natures) as to their unity in the one Christ, *connecting* them only by a *συνάφεια* in dignity, power, and appearance, and not rather by a *conjunction in physical union* (καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον συνόδεῳ τῇ καθ' ἑνώσειν φυσικῇ), let him be anathema."

This is the proposition on account of which the Nestorians accused S. Cyril of Monophysitism. But S. Athanasius had already spoken of an *ἑνώσις φυσικῇ*, and (like the Alexandrian Synod) had spoken of an union *κατὰ φύσιν*, without thereby intending to signify a mingling or confusion of the two natures in Christ. Rather by that expression did he understand the union of the Godhead and manhood into *one Being*, or *one existence*, in which they still remain two distinct elements, which are never mingled, but which are indissolubly connected (see above, p. 3). This mode of expression employed by his great predecessor Cyril now adopted, and understood, as he himself expressly declared in his reply to the polemic of Theodoret of Cyrus, by *ἑνώσις φυσικῇ*, not an *ἑνώσις εἰς μίαν φύσιν*, which would certainly be Monophysitism, but only a *true, real union*, an union into *one Being*, into *one existence*, in opposition to a merely *moral* or *external* union, such as the Nestorians admitted. In the first words of the anathematism before us Cyril would not and could not in any way deny the *duality* of natures, for he speaks everywhere of two natures in Christ; but he wishes to reject the *separating* of them. He *distinguishes* them indeed, but does not *divide* them.

4. "If any one divides the expressions which are used in the evangelical and apostolic writings or by the saints, in reference to Christ, or which are by Him applied to Himself, between two Persons (*προσώποις*) or Hypostases, and specially ascribes the one class to the man, separated from the divine Logos, and the other as divine merely to the Logos, let him be anathema."

5. "If any one ventures to say that Christ is a man who bears God (*θεοφόρον*), and not rather, that He is true God, as the One Son in nature, in accordance with the expression: 'The Word was made flesh' (S. John i. 14), and 'He partook of flesh and blood' (Ileb. ii. 14); let him be anathema."

6. "If any one ventures to say that the divine Logos is the God or Lord of Christ, and does not rather confess that one and the same is at the same time God and man, since, according to the Holy Scripture, the Logos became flesh, let him be anathema."

7. "If any one says that the divine Logos only worked in the man Jesus, and that the glory of the Only-begotten was only conjoined (*περιηφθαι*) with Jesus as something foreign; let him be anathema."

8. "If any one ventures to say that the man assumed is to be revered, praised, and acknowledged as God, along *with* God the Logos, as if the one were separate from the other—for this is the necessary meaning of the word *with* (*σύν*) which is always employed (by Nestorius)—and does not rather reverence Emmanuel in *one* reverence, and direct *one* praise to Him, as the Word made flesh; let him be anathema."

9. "If any one says that the *one* Lord Jesus Christ was glorified by the Spirit, as though the power thus employed, which is through Him, were a foreign one, as though He had first received from the Spirit might over evil demons, and miraculous power, and does not rather regard the Spirit by whom He wrought miracles as His own; let him be anathema."

10. "If any one says that it was not the divine Logos Himself, when He was made flesh and man, like us, but another than He, a man distinct from Him (*ἰδικῶς ἄνθρωπος*), who became our High Priest and Apostle (according to Heb. iii. 1 and Eph. v. 2); or says that He gave Himself as a sacrifice not for us alone, but also for Himself, although He as the sinless One needed no sacrifice; let him be anathema."

11. "If any one does not confess that the flesh of the Lord is life-giving, and belongs to the divine Logos as His own, but says that it belongs to another external to Him, who is united with Him only in dignity, or only participates in the divine indwelling; and does not rather hold it to be life-giving, for this reason, as we have said, that it belongs to the Logos, who can make all things live; let him be anathema."

12. "If any one does not confess that the Word of God suffered in (or after) the flesh, was crucified in the flesh, and tasted death in the flesh, and became the first-born from the

dead, since He as God is life and the life-giver; let him be anathema."¹

In a second, much shorter, and less important letter to the clergy and laity of Constantinople, the Alexandrian Synod, with Cyril at its head, expresses the hope that Nestorius will now forsake his false doctrines. But the zeal with which he has propagated them in sermons and writings, has made it necessary that Pope Cœlestine should limit him to a certain period for recanting, and no reproach can be brought against Cyril and the Synod on account of the long delay which has already occurred. Those whom they address should, however, hold fast by the orthodox doctrine, and have no communion with Nestorius.²

The Synod addressed a third letter to the monks of Constantinople,³ of similar purport with the preceding, and at the same time sent four commissioners with full authority to Constantinople — two Egyptian Bishops, Theopentus and Daniel; and two of the Alexandrian clergy, Potamon and Macarius, who, on a Sunday, in the Cathedral, solemnly and publicly delivered to Nestorius the synodal letter respecting him, together with the documents from Rome.⁴ He gave no answer, but appointed to meet the deputies on the following day; but when this arrived he did not admit them, nor did he give them a written answer, but, on the contrary, stirred up the Emperor Theodosius the younger, so that he endeavoured to frighten Cyril by threats in consequence of his persecution of Nestorius; and further, Nestorius published, on his part, twelve anathematisms, representing Cyril as a heretic. These have been preserved for us only by the Western layman Marius Mercator, who took a great interest in both the Pelagian and the Nestorian controversies, on the orthodox side, and employed his residence for the transaction of business in Constantinople, in translating the sermons and writings of Nestorius into Latin, so as to make them more accessible to the

¹ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1082; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1291; Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 578 ff.

² In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1093; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1295.

³ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1097; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1297.

⁴ We learn this from the account which these ambassadors subsequently gave at the Synod of Ephesus. Cf. also Baronius, *ad ann.* 430, n. 50 and 59.

Westerns. The twelve counter-anathematisms of Nestorius, of which each number corresponds with the same number of Cyril's, are as follow:¹—

1. "If any one says that Emmanuel is true God, and not rather *God with us*, that is, that He has united Himself to a like nature with ours, which He assumed from the Virgin Mary, and dwelt in it; and if any one calls Mary the mother of God the Logos, and not rather mother of Him who is Emmanuel; and if he maintains that God the Logos has *changed* Himself into flesh, which He only assumed in order to make His Godhead visible, and to be found in form as a man, let him be anathema."

2. "If any one asserts that, at the union of the Logos with the flesh, the divine Essence moved from one place to another; or says that the flesh is capable of receiving the divine nature, and unites this partially with the flesh; or ascribes to the flesh, by reason of its reception of God, an extension to the infinite and boundless, and says that God and man are one and the same in nature; let him be anathema."

3. "If any one says that Christ, who is also Emmanuel, is One, not (merely) in consequence of *connection*, but (also) in *nature*, and does not acknowledge the *connection* (*συνάφεια*) of the two natures, that of the Logos and of the assumed manhood, in one Son, as still continuing without *mingling*; let him be anathema."

4. "If any one assigns the expressions of the Gospels and apostolic letters, which refer to the two natures of Christ, to one only of those natures, and ascribes even suffering to the divine Logos, both in the flesh and in the Godhead; let him be anathema."

5. "If any one ventures to say that, even after the assumption of human nature, there is only one Son of God, namely, He who is so in nature (*naturaliter filius*=Logos), while He (since the assumption of the flesh) is certainly Emmanuel; let him be anathema."

6. "If any one, after the Incarnation, calls another than

¹ They are found best in Marius Mercator, ed. Migne, p. 909, together with the criticisms of Marius Mercator. Also in Mansi, t. iv. p. 1099; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1293. German, Fuchs, l.c. S. 588.

Christ the Logos,¹ and ventures to say that the form of a servant is equally with the Logos of God, without beginning and uncreated,² and not rather that it is made by Him as its natural Lord and Creator and God, and that He has promised to raise it again in the words: 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it up again;' let him be anathema."

7. "If any one says that the man who was formed of the Virgin is the *Only-begotten*, who was born from the bosom of the Father, before the morning star was (Ps. cix. 3),³ and does not rather confess that He has obtained the designation of *Only-begotten* on account of His connection with Him who in nature is the Only-begotten of the Father; and besides, if any one calls another than the Emmanuel Christ; let him be anathema."

8. "If any one says that the form of a servant should, for its own sake, that is, in reference to its own nature, be revered, and that it is the ruler of all things,⁴ and not rather, that (merely) on account of its connection with the holy and in itself universally ruling nature of the Only-begotten, it is to be revered; let him be anathema."

9. "If any one says that the form of a servant is of like nature with the Holy Ghost, and not rather that it owes its union with the Logos which has existed since the conception, to His mediation, by which it wrought miraculous healings among men, and possessed the power of expelling demons; let him be anathema."

10. "If any one maintains that the Word, who is from the beginning, has become the High Priest and Apostle of our confession, and has offered Himself for us, and does not rather say that it is the work of Emmanuel to be an apostle; and if any one in such a manner divides the sacrifice between Him who united (the Logos) and Him who was united (the man-

¹ This has no reference to Cyril; but is a hyper-Nestorianism, which Nestorius here rejects.

² This was asserted by some Apollinarists; and Nestorius accused S. Cyril of Apollinarianism.

³ [This is the reference in the original; but the Editor is unable to say to what it refers.]

⁴ On this point Marius Mercator already remarked with justice that no Catholic had ever asserted anything of the kind.

hood), referring it to a common sonship, that is, not giving to God that which is God's, and to man that which is man's; let him be anathema."

11. "If any one maintains that the flesh which is united with God the Word is by the power of its own nature life-giving, whereas the Lord Himself says, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing' (S. John vi. 64), let him be anathema." [He adds, "God is a Spirit" (S. John iv. 24). "If, then, any one maintains that God the Logos has in a carnal manner, in His substance, become flesh, and persists in this with reference to the Lord Christ, who Himself after His resurrection said to His disciples, 'Handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having' (S. Luke xxiv. 39); let him be anathema."]¹

12. "If any one, in confessing the sufferings of the flesh, ascribes these also to the Logos of God, as to the flesh in which He appeared, and thus does not distinguish the dignity of the natures; let him be anathema."

One can easily see that Nestorius is here doing battle with windmills, since he ascribes to S. Cyril views which he never held. But, at the same time, he allows his own error in many ways to appear,—his separation of the divine and human in Christ, and his rending of the one Christ in two.

It was, however, not Nestorius merely, but the whole Antiochene school in general, which was dissatisfied with the anathematisms of Cyril, and particularly John, Archbishop of Antioch, Andrew, Bishop of Samosata, and the celebrated Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, thought that they detected in them Apollinarian errors, which they opposed in letters and treatises. John of Antioch especially found fault, in a letter to Firmus, Archbishop of Cæsarea, and other Oriental Bishops,² with the third anathematism, from its saying that the flesh of Christ was one nature with the Godhead, and that the manhood and Godhead in Christ constitute only one nature. He thus misunderstood the expression *ἐν ὧσιν φύσικῃ*,

¹ The part enclosed in brackets is certainly a spurious addition, and is wanting in many mss. Cf. Marius Mercator, ed. Migne, p. 919.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 756; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1347. German by Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 595 ff.

and added that he could not believe that this sentence really proceeded from Cyril, and now, in a manner wholly inconsistent with his previous letter to Nestorius, came round to his side, especially as the latter had recently declared his willingness to admit the expression *God-bearer* in a certain sense. Andrew of Samosata wrote a whole book against the anathematisms of Cyril, and a considerable part of it has been preserved for us in an apologia of Cyril's directed against it,¹ from which we see that Andrew contested every one of those twelve propositions, but particularly the third, where he professed to see in the expression *ἐνωσις φυσικὴ* a mingling of the two natures, and consequently *monophysitism*. Still more weight had the voice of Theodoret, particularly as he combated the anathematisms of Cyril, and not in one treatise only, but in several,² written partly of his own accord, and partly at the request of his ecclesiastical superior, the Bishop of Antioch.

Some, and particularly Protestant scholars, for example, Schröckh,³ Fuchs,⁴ and others, have ventured to maintain that Cyril departed at least as far as Nestorius, if not further, from the orthodox line, and that the whole controversy between the two was a mere strife of words, and did not touch the kernel of Christianity. In opposition to this assertion, which is as false as it is superficial, Dr. Gengler expresses himself, in his treatise on the condemnation of Nestorius,⁵ in the following admirable manner: "In truth, the controversy by which the Church, after storms which had scarcely been stilled, was shaken anew in the middle of the fifth century, was not merely about a *word*, but the question had reference to a whole system of doctrinal propositions, which in their organic connection threatened to destroy the kernel of the Christian faith, and to this system the expression *θεοτόκος* was not adapted. In opposition to this false theory, in which Nestorius

¹ Cyrilli *Apologeticus adv. Orientales*, Opp. t. vi. p. 159 sqq.

² Theodoret, *Reprehensio xii. Anathematismatorum Cyrilli*, Opp. edit. Schulze, t. v. pp. 1-68; Theodoret *Epist. ad Joann. Antioch. ibid.* t. iv. p. 1268; and in Cyrilli Opp. ed. Aubert, t. vi. p. 203 sqq.

³ *Kirchengesch.* Bd. 18, S. 222.

⁴ *Biblioth. d. Kirchenvers.* Bd. iii. S. 565, Anm. 627, and S. 587, Anm. 654.

⁵ In the *Tübing. theol. Quartalschrift*, 1835, Heft 2, S. 216.

was thoroughly entangled, this expression was the very shibboleth of the true Christian doctrine, and had for the doctrinal controversies of the fifth century the same significance as the expression *ὁμοούσιος* in the Arian controversy. - This truth stood plain and clear before the mind of Cyril. - He declared, and he was most clearly conscious, that this was the state of the controversy. He compared in the same way, as has already been mentioned, the expression *θεοτόκος* with *ὁμοούσιος*, and truly; for just as the great Athanasius saved the Christian doctrine of the Logos by his persistent and energetic defence of the *ὁμοούσιος*, so Cyril, by his defence of the *θεοτόκος*, saved the true doctrine of the incarnation of the Logos. This was acknowledged also by his contemporaries; they gave him the commendation which he deserved by calling him a second Athanasius. He was that. With the same clearness as Athanasius, he grasped the real point of the controversy *from the very beginning*. He was not fighting with shadows. There was no need for his views to grow clearer in the course of the controversy. At the end he maintained nothing different from what he asserted at the beginning, and the confession of faith which he subscribed at the end was not a retraction,—it was nothing but what he had long maintained, but which his opponents, in their passionate blindness, could not or would not acknowledge."

CHAPTER II.

BEGINNING, CONFLICT, AND VICTORY OF THE SYNOD OF EPHESUS.

SEC. 133. *Convocation of the Synod—The Papal and Imperial Commissioners.*

AS we have already seen, it was not long after the outbreak of the Nestorian controversy that it was proposed to hold an Œcumenical Council for its settlement, and this was expressly demanded both by the orthodox and by Nestorius.¹ In his third letter to Pope Cœlestine, Nestorius spoke of this (see above, p. 28); and, in like manner, the letter of the monks of Constantinople to the Emperor, in which they complained of the ill-treatment which they had received from Nestorius, contains a loudly-expressed desire for the application of this ecclesiastical remedy.² In fact, the Emperor Theodosius II., so early as November 19, 430, and thus a few days before the anathematisms of Cyril arrived at Constantinople, issued a circular letter, bearing also the name of his Western colleague, Valentinian III., addressed to all the metropolitans, in which he summoned them, for the Pentecost of the following year, to an Œcumenical Synod at Ephesus. He added that each of them should bring with him from his province some able suffragan bishops, and that whoever should arrive too late should be gravely responsible before God and the Emperor.³ Theodosius was in this visibly anxious that he should not allow that prepossession for Nestorius, which he had already betrayed on several occasions,

¹ Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 7.

² In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1102; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1335. German in Fuchs, *Bibl. der Kirchenvers.* Bd. iii. S. 592.

³ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1111; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1343. German in Fuchs, *l.c.* Bd. ii. S. 603.

to appear in this important document; and therefore this feeling showed itself the more openly in his letter (*Sacra imperialia*), already referred to (see above, p. 23), addressed to Cyril, in which he accuses him of having disturbed the peace, of having given forth rash utterances, of not having acted openly and honourably, and of having brought everything to confusion. Particularly he blamed him for having communicated in writing with the Augusta (co-Empress) Pulcheria, and the consort of the Emperor, Eudocia, and for having most improperly endeavoured, by means of this letter, in an underhand way, to work out a malicious design of sowing discord even in the imperial family. Still he would forgive him what was past; and he added that on the subject of the contested doctrinal propositions the future Synod would decide, and that what they should decide must be universally accepted. It would be especially a duty for Cyril to appear at the Council, for the Emperor would not endure that any one should only be a ruler, and not take common counsel with others, nor allow himself to be taught by them. The conclusion of the letter contains some further bitter remarks of a similar character.¹

The Emperor had despatched a peculiarly respectful letter to Augustine, on account of his great celebrity, inviting him to come to the Synod at Ephesus, and had expressly entrusted an official of the name of Ebagnius with the delivery of the letter. But Augustine was already (August 22 [28], 430) dead, and thus the bearer of the letter could only bring back to Constantinople the news of his death.²

Cyril, on his part, now found it necessary to ask of Pope Cœlestine whether Nestorius should be allowed to appear at the proposed Synod as a member, or whether the sentence of deposition pronounced against him, after the period of time allowed for recanting had elapsed, should now still have effect. We no longer possess this letter itself, but we have the answer

¹ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1109; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1342. German in Fuchs, l.c. S. 599 ff.

² Cf. *Liberati Breviar. causæ Nestorianorum et Eutych.* c. 5, and the letter of Capreolus, Archbishop of Carthage, to the Synod of Ephesus, in Mansi, t. iv. p. 1207; in Hardouin, t. i. p. 1419.

of the Pope, dated May 7, 431, which gives a beautiful proof of his peace-loving disposition, and in which he says, God willeth not the death of the sinner, but his conversion, and that Cyril should do everything in order to restore the peace of the Church and to win Nestorius to the truth. If the latter is quite determined against this, then he must reap what, with the help of the devil, he has sown.¹ A second letter was addressed by the Pope, May 15, 431, to the Emperor Theodosius, saying that he could not personally be present at the Synod, but that he would take part in it by commissioners. The Emperor should allow no innovations, and no disturbance of the peace of the Church. He should even regard the interests of the Faith as higher than those of the State, and the peace of the Church as more important than the peace of the nations.² As his legates at the Synod, the Pope appointed the two bishops, Arcadius and Projectus, together with the priest Philippus, and gave them a commission to hold strictly by Cyril, but at the same time to preserve the dignity of the Apostolic See. They were to take part in the assemblies, but not themselves to *mix* in the discussions (between the Nestorians and their opponents), but to *give judgment* on the views of others. After the close of the Synod an inquiry should be instituted, *requirendum est, qualiter fuerint res finitæ*. If the old faith triumphed, and Cyril went to the Emperor at Constantinople, they were also to go there and deliver to the Prince the papal briefs. If, however, no peaceful decision were arrived at, they were to consider with Cyril what must be done.³ The papal letter, which they had to lay before the Synod, dated May 8, 431, first explains with much eloquence the duty of the bishops to preserve the true faith, and then, at the close, goes on: "The legates are to be present at the transactions of the Synod, and will give effect to that which the Pope has long ago decided with respect to Nestorius, for he does not doubt that the assembled bishops will agree with this."⁴

¹ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1292; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1474.

² In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1291; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1473.

³ In Hardouin, t. i. p. 1347; Mansi, t. iv. p. 556.

⁴ In Hardouin, t. i. p. 1467; Mansi, t. iv. p. 1283 sqq.

As the Pope, so neither could either of the Emperors appear personally at Ephesus, and therefore Theodosius II., in his own name and in that of his colleague Valentinian III., appointed the Count Candidian (captain of the imperial body-guard) as the protector of the Council. In the edict which he addressed to the Synod on this subject, he says that Candidian is to take no immediate part in the discussions on contested points of faith; for it is not becoming that one who does not belong to the number of the bishops should mix himself up in the examination and decision of theological controversies. On the contrary, Candidian was to remove from the city the monks and laymen who had come or should afterwards come to Ephesus out of curiosity, so that disorder and confusion should not be caused by those who were in no way needed for the examination of the sacred doctrines. He was, besides, to watch lest the discussions among the members of the Synod themselves should degenerate into violent disputes and hinder the more exact investigation of truth; and, on the contrary, see that every statement should be heard with attention, and that every one put forward his view, or his objections, without let or hindrance, so that at last an unanimous decision might be arrived at in peace by the holy Synod. But above all, Candidian was to take care that no member of the Synod should attempt, before the close of the transactions, to go home, or to the court, or elsewhere. Moreover, he was not to allow that any other matter of controversy should be taken into consideration before the settlement of the principal point of doctrine before the Council. Further, the Emperor had given order that no civil accusation should be brought against any member of the Synod, either before the Synod itself or before the court of justice in Ephesus; but that, during this time, only the supreme court at Constantinople should be the competent tribunal for such cases. Finally, a second imperial count, Irenæus, was to appear at Ephesus, but he was only to accompany his friend, the God-beloved Bishop Nestorius, and therefore should take no part in the transactions of the Synod, nor in the commission of Candidian.¹

¹ In Hardouin, t. i. p. 1346; Mansi, t. iv. p. 1118. German in Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 605.

In accordance with the imperial command, the Synod was to begin at Pentecost (June 7) in the year 431,¹ and Nestorius, with his sixteen bishops, was among the first who arrived at Ephesus. As though going to battle, he was accompanied by a large number of men in armour.² Soon afterwards, four or five days before Pentecost, Cyril arrived, with fifty bishops, about one-half of his suffragans; and we still possess two short letters from him to his Church, of which the one was written on the journey at Rhodes, and the other immediately after his arrival at Ephesus.³ In the latter he says particularly that he looks forward with longing to the actual opening of the Synod. Some days after Pentecost, Juvenal of Jerusalem and Flavian of Thessalonica appeared with their bishops; Archbishop Memnon of Ephesus, too, had assembled around him⁴ forty of his suffragans and twelve bishops from Pamphylia. While they were waiting for the arrival of the others, there was already a good deal of preliminary conversation on the point in question, and particularly Cyril endeavoured to drive Nestorius into a corner by acute arguments, and to gain friends for the true doctrine. It was then that Nestorius allowed himself to break out into the exclamation: "Never will I call a child,⁵ two or three months old, God; and I will have no more communication with you;" and at the same time showed clearly the nature of his heresy, which, up to this time, he had endeavoured in various ways to disguise, and also his obstinacy, which left no hope of his submission to the decision of a Synod.

SEC. 134. *First Session, June 22, 431.—Presidency and
Number of those present.*

There was still wanting one of the superior metropolitans (patriarchs), namely, John of Antioch. His bishops, he said, could not leave their dioceses before Renovation Sunday

¹ Hardouin, t. i. p. 1435; Mansi, t. iv. p. 1230.

² Socrates, vii. 34.

³ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1115 sqq.

⁴ Hardouin, t. i. p. 1541; Mansi, t. iv. p. 1381.

⁵ Socrates, *l.c.*; Schröckh, in his *Kirchengesch.* (Bd. 18, S. 235), has perverted and misunderstood this and many other passages in the original authorities in a partial manner, to the disadvantage of Cyril.

(*Dominica in Albis*), and then it would take them twelve days to travel to Antioch, and from thence to Ephesus thirty-nine, so that they could not arrive until some days after Pentecost.¹ At last (just about Pentecost²) John came into the neighbourhood of Ephesus, and sent to Cyril a letter, which is still extant, full of friendliness, setting forth that the length of the road and the death of several of their horses had delayed the journey, but that nevertheless he was close at hand, and would appear at Ephesus in five or six days.³ In spite of this they waited sixteen days;⁴ and then two of the metropolitans of the patriarchate of Antioch, Alexander of Apamea and Alexander of Hierapolis, came and repeatedly declared that "John had bid them say that they were no longer to defer the opening of the Synod on his account, but, in case it should be necessary for him to delay longer, they were to do what was to be done."⁵ From this they inferred that the Patriarch John was intending to avoid being personally present at the condemnation of his former priest and friend Nestorius. Cyril and his friends now decided therefore on the immediate opening of the Synod, and assembled for that purpose on the 28th day of the Egyptian month Payni (= June 22) 431, in the cathedral of Ephesus, which, with great suitableness for that assembly, was dedicated to the *God-bearer*, and named after her.⁶ On the day before, several bishops received a commission to go to Nestorius and invite him to the session, in order to give an account of his statements and doctrines. At first he replied, "I will consider it." When, however, a second deputation, sent on the 22d of June by the Synod, then opening, came to him, his residence was, by command of Candidian,

¹ Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* i. c. 3.

² This date is evident from the fact that the Synod says that they had already waited for John of Antioch sixteen days. And Cyril remarks that they had waited for sixteen days after receiving intelligence of the approach of John. Cf. Mansi, t. iv. p. 1230 with 1331, and Hardouin, t. i. p. 1435 with 1506.

³ In Hardouin, t. i.* p. 1347; Mansi, t. iv. p. 1121.

⁴ Cyril says they waited sixteen days after receiving this message, in Hardouin, t. i. p. 1435; Mansi, t. iv. p. 1230.

⁵ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1330 sq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1506. These two Alexanders afterwards signed, with Nestorius, the protest against the first session of Ephesus; see below, p. 54.

⁶ Cf. Cyril's *Letters* in Mansi, t. iv. pp. 1242 and 1230.

surrounded with troops, who prevented the bishops, by threats of blows, from entering, and Nestorius sent them word that "he would appear as soon as *all* the bishops were assembled." The Synod now, for the third time, sent off some bishops to him; but these received no further answer, and were treated with insolence by the soldiers on guard in and around the house.¹

At an earlier period, sixty-eight Asiatic bishops, among whom were, in particular, Theodoret of Cyrus and the two above-mentioned metropolitans of Apamea and Hierapolis, in a letter to Cyril and Juvenal, had requested that they would be pleased to defer the opening of the Synod until the arrival of bishops from Antioch.² Now, however, the imperial commissioner, Candidian, himself appeared in the place of assembly, in order to have the imperial decrees read, and to protest against the immediate opening of the Synod.³ His demand, that they should wait four days longer, remained disregarded, and the first solemn session began under the presidency of Cyril, who, as is expressly stated in the Acts, also represented the Pope.⁴ No fewer than 160 bishops were present from the beginning,⁵ and when (still at the first session) the document of deposition came to be subscribed, their number had increased to 198.⁶ Particularly were there twenty of those sixty-eight Asiatic bishops who had gone over to the side of the Synod, as is clear from a comparison of their names with the subscriptions of the synodal Acts.⁷ The first thing which was done at the Synod was the reading of the imperial letter of convocation to all the metropolitans (see above, p. 40). That they should begin with this had been proposed by the

¹ Cf. *Acta Synodi Ephes.* Actio i., Hardouin, t. i. pp. 1358 sqq. Cf. pp. 1435 and 1506; Mansi, t. iv. p. 1131 sqq. Cf. p. 1230 sq. and p. 1131. In German by Fuchs, *Bibl. d. Kircheng.* Bd. iv. S. 50 ff.

² Hardouin, t. i. p. 1350; Mansi, t. v. p. 765.

³ In Hardouin, t. i. p. 1351; Mansi, t. v. p. 770.

⁴ That Cyril presided as Pope's vicar is asserted also by Mennas of Constantinople and other Greek bishops in their letter to Pope Vigilius, in Mansi, t. ix. p. 62; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 10.

⁵ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1123 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1354. More exactly, there were 159 bishops and one deacon, Bessula of Carthage, as representative of his bishop.

⁶ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1211 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1423.

⁷ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1211 sqq., cf. with t. v. p. 766; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1423, cf. with p. 1350.

Presbyter Peter of Alexandria, who acted as senior notary during the whole Synod, and externally controlled the arrangement of the business.¹ Thereupon Bishop Memnon of Ephesus pointed out that sixteen days had elapsed beyond the limit appointed for the opening; and Cyril explained that, even in accordance with the express command of the Emperor, they must without delay begin with the transactions respecting the faith. Thereupon reference was made to the first invitation sent to Nestorius on the previous day, and directly afterwards the second and third deputations, already referred to, were sent to him, and the reports of the bishops who had returned were received.² As Nestorius decidedly declined to appear, they proceeded, on the motion of Juvenal, to an examination of the point of doctrine in question, and began by reading the Nicene Creed.³ They next proceeded to the reading of the second letter which Cyril, as we saw, had a long time before addressed to Nestorius, in which he had explained the doctrine of the *hypostatic* union of the Godhead and manhood in Christ (see above, p. 21). To the question of Cyril, whether this letter of his agreed with the contents of the Nicene Creed, all the bishops present answered, and among them 126 in short speeches still preserved (explanatory of their votes), in a manner entirely affirmative and consentient, and for the most part full of commendation for Cyril.⁴ It then came to the turn to read the letter which Nestorius had sent in answer to the letter of Cyril just mentioned (see above, p. 21), and after thirty-four bishops, in explaining their votes, had declared emphatically its non-agreement with the Nicene faith, all the bishops cried out together: "If any one does not anathematize Nestorius, let him be himself anathema; the true faith anathematizes him, the holy Synod anathematizes him. If any one has communion with Nestorius, let him be anathema. We all anathematize the letter and the doctrines of Nestorius. We all anathematize the heretic Nestorius and his

¹ Cf. Mansi, t. iv. p. 1127 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1355 sqq.

² There is no reference in the Acts to what was said or transacted in the Synod in the intermediate times during which the envoys came back from Nestorius.

³ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1123 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1354 sqq.

⁴ In Mansi, t. iv. pp. 1139-1170; Hardouin, t. i. pp. 1363-1387.

adherents, and his impious faith and his impious doctrine. We all anathematize the impious (*ἀσεβῆς*) Nestorius," and so forth.¹

Afterwards there were two other documents read, namely, the letter of Cœlestine and the Roman Synod (p. 25 f.), and that of S. Cyril and of the Alexandrian Synod to Nestorius;² and the four clerics whom Cyril had sent to deliver that document to Nestorius were examined as to the result of their mission. They gave the information, with which we are already acquainted (see above, p. 34), that Nestorius had given them no answer at all. In order, however, to be quite clear as to whether he still persisted in his error, two bishops, Theodotus of Ancyra and Acacius of Melitene, who were personal friends of Nestorius, and had during the last three days been in habitual intercourse with him, and had endeavoured to convert him from his error, were questioned on oath respecting the matter. They announced that, unfortunately, all their efforts with him had been in vain.³

In order, however, to submit the doctrinal point in question to a thorough investigation, and in the light of patristic testimony, at the suggestion of Flavian, Bishop of Philippi, a number of passages from the writings of the Fathers of the Church were now read, in which the ancient faith respecting the union of the Godhead and manhood in Christ was expressed. These were statements of the opinions of Peter, Bishop of Alexandria († 311), of Athanasius, Pope Julius I. († 352), Pope Felix I. († 274), Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria († 412), of Cyprian, Ambrose, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Atticus of Constan-

¹ Mansi, t. iv. pp. 1170-1178; Hardouin, t. i. pp. 1387-1395.

² This is the synodal letter to which the twelve anathematisms were appended. We were formerly of opinion that these anathematisms were read at Ephesus, but not expressly confirmed, as there is hardly anything on the subject in the Acts. But in the fifth (Ecumenical Council (Collatio vi.) it is said: "*Chalcedonensis sancta Synodus Cyrillum sanctæ memoriæ doctorem sibi adscribit et suscipit synodicas ejus epistolas, quarum uni 12 capitula supposita sunt*" (Mansi, t. ix. p. 341; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 167). If, however, the anathematisms of Cyril were expressly confirmed at Chalcedon, there was even more reason for doing so at Ephesus. And Ibas, in his well-known letter to Maris, says expressly that the Synod of Ephesus confirmed the anathematisms of Cyril, and the same was asserted even by the bishops of Antioch at Ephesus in a letter to the Emperor, of which mention will hereafter be made in sec. 145 (Hardouin, t. ii. p. 530).

³ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1182; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1398; Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 59.

tinople († 426), and Amphilochius of Iconium († 394). All these early authorities knew nothing of the Nestorian separation of the Godhead and manhood, but, on the contrary, taught the true incarnation of the Logos. The venerable martyr, Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, said: "God the Logos was made flesh, and born of the Virgin's womb;" but Athanasius used frequently and unhesitatingly the expression *θεοτόκος*, contested by Nestorius, and says: "As the flesh was born of the God-bearer Mary, so we say that HE (the Logos) was Himself born of Mary." And in a second passage Athanasius strongly blames those who (exactly like Nestorius) say that "the suffering and crucified Christ is not God the Logos;" who distinguish between Christ and the Logos, and do not confess, and do not acknowledge, "that the Logos, inasmuch as HE assumed a body from Mary, was made man." And in a third passage Athanasius teaches that "the Logos was in truth, in the full sense of the word (not *θέσει* = by adoption, external connection), made man, otherwise HE would not be our Redeemer." In agreement with this Pope Julius said: "There are not two sons, one true who assumed the man, and another the man who was assumed by God, but an only-begotten God in heaven, and an only-begotten God on earth." Even Pope Felix I., who lived more than a century and a half before Nestorius, rejected his error, when he wrote: "We believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, who was born of the Virgin Mary, that HE is the eternal Son and Word of God, and not a man assumed by God, distinct from that (Word). For the Son of God did not assume a man, so that this was distinct from Him, but HE, the perfect God, was at the same time perfect man, made flesh of the Virgin." Less striking are the passages from Cyprian and Ambrose; but Gregory of Nazianzus is again quite explicit: "We do not sever the man from the Godhead, but declare both to be one and the same who at the beginning was not man, but God, and the only Son of God, before all time and without all corporeity, but who at the end of the ages assumed man for the sake of our salvation. We confess that HE is one and the same, divine and earthly, visible and invisible, and so forth, at the same time, so that through the whole man, who is at the same time God, the whole man, who

has fallen into sin, is created anew." The seven anathematisms, too, which Gregory of Nazianzus appends to this passage, are entirely anti-Nestorian, and the very first of them anathematizes those who do not call Mary *θεοτόκος*, and the fourth those who hold that there are *two* sons, the one eternal from the Father, and a second from Mary. Further, the passage selected from Basil sounds as if it had been written with reference to Nestorius; for it says: "The immeasurable and infinite God, without being capable of suffering (in Himself), by assuming flesh combated death, in order by His *own* suffering to deliver us from liability to suffering." To the same effect, in fine, speak also Gregory of Nyssa, Atticus of Constantinople, Amphilochius of Iconium, and Theophilus of Antioch, "that God was born and died."¹

In opposition to these patristic passages there were next read twenty passages, some longer and some shorter, from the writings of Nestorius, in which his fundamental views, which we have presented above connectedly, were expressed in separate parts and *in concreto*.²

The last document which was produced at this first session was the letter of Capreolus, Archbishop of Carthage, in which he asks them, on account of the war in Africa (consequent upon the invasion of the Vandals), to excuse his own inability to be present, or to send any of his suffragan bishops. Besides, he said, the Emperor's letter of invitation had not reached him until Easter 431, and thus too late; and Augustine, whose presence the Emperor specially wished, had died some time before. He (the archbishop) therefore sent only his deacon Bessula, and prayed the Synod to tolerate no novelties whatever in matters of religion.³ In this he does not refer expressly to Nestorius, but he unmistakeably indicates that he reckons his doctrines among the unauthorized novelties. The Synod gave its approval to this letter of the African bishop, and proceeded at once (the intermediate speeches are not known to us) to the

¹ All these passages are given by Mansi, t. iv. pp. 1183-1195, and by Hardouin, t. i. pp. 1399-1410. German by Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 61 ff.

² In Mansi, t. iv. pp. 1198-1207; Hardouin, t. i. pp. 1410-1419. German in Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 69 ff.

³ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1207 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1419 sqq.; Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 76.

condemnation of Nestorius. The sentence is as follows:¹ ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος εἶπε· Πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις μῆτε ὑπακοῦσαι βουλῇ-
θέντος τοῦ ἀσεβεστάτου Νεστορίου τῇ παρ' ἡμῶν κλήσει, μῆτε
μὴν τοὺς παρ' ἡμῶν ἀποσταλέντας ἁγιωτάτους καὶ Θεοσεβε-
στάτους ἐπισκόπους δεξαμένους, ἀναγκαίως ἐχωρήσαμεν ἐπὶ τὴν
ἐξέτασιν τῶν δυσσεβηθέντων αὐτῷ. Καὶ φωρίσαντες αὐτὸν ἔκ
τε τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν συγγραμμάτων αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν
ἀρτίως παρ' αὐτοῦ ῥηθέντων κατὰ τήνδε τὴν μητρόπολιν καὶ
πρόσμαρτυρηθέντων, δυσσεβῶς φρονοῦντα καὶ κηρύττοντα,
ἀναγκαίως κατεπειχθέντες ἀπὸ τε τῶν κανόνων, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐπισ-
τολῆς τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ Κελε-
στίνου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας, δακρύσαντες
πολλάκις, ἐπὶ τὴν σκυθρωπὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐχωρήσαμεν ἀπόφασιν.
Ὁ βλασφημηθεὶς τοίνυν παρ' αὐτοῦ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς
ᾧρισε διὰ τῆς παρούσης ἁγιωτάτης συνόδου, ἄλλότριον εἶναι
τὸν αὐτὸν Νεστόριον τοῦ ἐπισκοπικοῦ ἀξιώματος καὶ παντὸς
συλλόγου ἱερατικοῦ; that is: "As, in addition to other things,
the impious Nestorius has not obeyed our citation, and did
not receive the holy bishops who were sent by us to him, we
were compelled to examine his ungodly doctrines. We dis-
covered that he had held and published impious doctrines in
his letters and treatises, as well as in discourses which he
delivered in this city, and which have been testified to.
Urged by the canons (c. 74, *Apostol.*), and in accordance with
the letter of our most holy father and fellow-servant Cælestine,
the Roman bishop, we have come, with many tears, to this sor-
rowful sentence against him, namely, that our Lord Jesus Christ,
whom he has blasphemed, decrees by the holy Synod that
Nestorius be excluded from the episcopal dignity, and from all
priestly communion."

As we have already remarked above, this judgment was in
the first place subscribed by 198 bishops who were present.
Some others afterwards took the same side, so that altogether
over 200 subscribed.²

The session had lasted from early in the morning into the
night, and the assembled population of Ephesus waited the
whole day to hear the decision. When this was at last known,

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1211; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1422; Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 78.

² In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1226; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1431.

there arose an universal rejoicing; they commended the Synod, and solemnly accompanied the members, particularly Cyril, with torches and censers to their houses. The city was also illuminated in many places. This is joyfully related by Cyril in one of the three letters which he despatched at that time to the members of his Church of Alexandria, and to the monks of Egypt.¹

On the next day the sentence which had been pronounced was sent to Nestorius himself in a very laconic edict. In the superscription he is called a new Judas, and in the text it is said briefly: "He must know that, on account of his impious doctrines and his disobedience to the canons (because he had not appeared in answer to the citations), he had been, on the 22d of June, in accordance with the ecclesiastical laws, deposed by the holy Synod, and expelled from the body of the clergy."²

In two other similarly curt letters of the same date, the one to the collective people, the other to the clergy of Constantinople, the Synod announced that which had been done, and required the latter to watch carefully over all the property of the Church of Constantinople, so as to be able to give an account of it to him who should, in accordance with the will of God and the indication (*νεύματι*) of the Emperor, become bishop of that city.³

Cyril, as president of the Synod, wrote at greater length to his friends and agents in Constantinople, the Archimandrite Dalmatius and several (certainly Egyptian) bishops and priests, and related to them the whole course of the session, from the citation of Nestorius to his deposition, with the request that they would take care that no false rumours on the subject should go abroad. It was reputed that Count Candidian had already sent such false information (to the Emperor); whereas the Synod had not yet completed its full report (together with the Acts) to the Emperor.⁴

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1242 sq.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1227; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1434; Fuchs, l.c. S. 79.

³ In Mansi, t. iv. pp. 1227 and 1242; Hardouin, t. i. pp. 1434 and 1443.

⁴ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1230 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1434. Such a complete report, provided with the Acts of the Synod, certainly needed longer time to prepare, for during the session the notaries made only short remarks, notes (hence their

SEC. 135. *Opposition. The Conciliabulum of the Antiochene Bishops.*

Candidian had, in fact, not only done what has been mentioned, but also had caused the placards to be torn down by which the sentence against Nestorius was to have been published, and had imposed silence upon the criers who proclaimed it in the city.¹ At the same time he published an edict proclaiming his great displeasure with what had been done, and declared that which only *a part* had done before the arrival of John of Antioch, as well as the Latin bishops, to be wholly invalid, and in a separate letter adjured those bishops who had not taken part in the first session, not to give their adhesion to the others, but to await the opening of the Œcumenical Synod.² Nestorius, too, did not fail to raise complaints, and immediately, even before the arrival of John of Antioch, addressed a letter to the Emperors, setting forth that the Egyptians and Asiatics had, of their own will, held a session, and thus had gone against the imperial command, which required a common consultation which should embrace all. Moreover, the people of Ephesus had been specially stirred up by their bishop, Memnon, and misled into committing all kinds of acts of violence against Nestorius and his friends. They had forced their way into their residences, had dispersed their meetings there, and had even threatened them with death. For this reason they had decided to take refuge in the Church of St. John or in a martyr's chapel,³ and hold their sessions there; but Memnon had shut every door against them. The Emperor, therefore, was requested to allow them to return home again, or to protect them in Ephesus, and to see to the holding of a genuine Synod, at which only bishops should be present, and not monks and clerics, and further, only such bishops as were specially summoned to it. And for this purpose *two* learned

name), respecting what was spoken; and it was only afterwards that the matter was regularly committed to paper, and the Acts of the Synod prepared. Cf. Tillemont, t. xiv. p. 405.

¹ Cf. his own relation in Mansi, t. iv. p. 1263; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1451.

² In Hardouin, t. i. p. 1447; Mansi, t. v. p. 772.

³ [See s.v. *Martyrium* in Smith and Cheetham's *Dictionary of Antiquities*.]

bishops from each province, together with the metropolitan, would be sufficient. Besides Nestorius, ten other bishops signed this document: Fritilas of Heraclea, in Thrace; Helladius of Tarsus; Dexianus of Seleucia; Himerius of Nicomedia; Alexander of Apamea; Euthérius of Tyana; Basilius of Thessaly; Maximus of Anazarbus; Alexander of Hierapolis; and Dorotheus of Marcianopolis in Mysia.¹

In order to preserve public opinion in Ephesus on the side of the Synod, sermons were preached by Cyril and by Rheginus, Archbishop of Constantia (Salamis), in Cyprus, and also repeatedly by Theodotus of Ancyra, in opposition to the heresy of Nestorius,² and the Synod now sent to the Emperors their complete report, of which we have already spoken, in which it was specially explained why it had not been thought proper to wait longer before beginning the first session. Not only had sixteen days elapsed from the period of the opening of the Council appointed by the Emperors, but many bishops had already fallen sick at Ephesus, and some had even died, and particularly, the most aged of the bishops were earnestly longing to return home. Besides, John of Antioch had requested them, through Alexander of Apamea and Alexander of Hierapolis, to begin at once. They had therefore, notwithstanding the refusal of Nestorius to appear, opened the Synod on the 22d of June, and in doing so had placed the holy Gospel, as the representative of Christ, on the throne which was set up in the midst of the assembly. Then all besides which had taken place in the first session was accurately and particularly related and described to Pope Cœlestine, who had already pronounced the same judgment as the Synod upon Nestorius. Finally, the Emperors were entreated to take care

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1234; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1438. In the Latin translation of this document (in the *Synodicon Irenæi*, in Mansi, t. v. p. 766) six other bishops are found subscribing (e.g. Julian of Sardica), and it is added at the end: "Et omnes alii, qui erant pariter, subscripserunt similiter."

² Their homilies are given by Mansi, t. iv. p. 1246 sqq., t. v. p. 218 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. pp. 1443 and 1663, 1666. One of Cyril's two sermons was delivered when seven additional bishops of the synodal party gave in their adhesion, and were present at divine service in the Church of Maria Deipara. Others are described as having been delivered "on the day of S. John the Evangelist," but we should probably read "at the Church of S. John the Evangelist" instead. Cf. Tillemont, t. xiv. p. 401 sq.

that the heresy should be eradicated from all the Churches and the books of Nestorius burnt. The Acts of the Synod, which had in the meantime been prepared, were also enclosed.¹

A few days afterwards, on the 26th or 27th of June,² John of Antioch arrived at last at Ephesus, and the Synod immediately sent a deputation to meet him, consisting of several bishops and clerics, to show him proper respect, and at the same time to make him acquainted with the deposition of Nestorius, so that he might not be drawn into any intercourse with him. The soldiers who surrounded Archbishop John prevented the deputation from speaking to him in the street; consequently they accompanied him to his abode, but were compelled to wait here for several hours, exposed to the insults of the soldiers, and at last, when they had discharged their commission, were driven home, ill-treated and beaten. Count Irenæus, the friend of Nestorius, had suggested this treatment, and approved of it. The envoys immediately informed the Synod of what had happened, and showed the wounds which they had received, which called forth great indignation against John of Antioch. According to the representation of Memnon,³ excommunication was for this reason pronounced against him; but we shall see further on that this did not take place until afterwards, and it is clear that Memnon, in his very brief narrative, has passed over an intermediate portion—the threefold invitation of John.⁴ In the meantime, Candidian had gone still further in his opposition to the members of the Synod, causing them to be annoyed and insulted by his soldiers, and even cutting off their supply of food, while he provided Nestorius with a regular body-guard of armed peasants.⁵ John of Antioch, immediately after his

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1235 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1439 sqq. German in Fuchs, l.c. Bd. iv. S. 80 ff.

² This date is clear from the Acts of the Conciliabulum which was held by John of Antioch. See the following pages. The only question is, whether the 22d of June should be reckoned among the *five* days of which the Conciliabulum speaks or not. In the one case, John would have arrived on the 26th (Friday); in the other, not until Saturday the 27th. Cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. xiv. note 45, *Sur St. Cyrille*.

³ In his letter in Mansi, t. iv. p. 1438; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1595.

⁴ This is confirmed by the remarks of Tillemont, t. xiv. note 46, *Sur St. Cyrille*.

⁵ Cf. *Epistola Memnonis*, ll. cc.

arrival, while still dusty from the journey,¹ and at the time when he was allowing the envoys of the Synod to wait, held at his own residence a Conciliabulum with his adherents, at which, first of all, Count Candidian related how Cyril and his friends, in spite of all warnings, and in opposition to the imperial decrees, had held a session five days before, had contested his (the count's) right to be present, had dismissed the bishops sent by Nestorius, and had paid no attention to the letters of others. Before he proceeded further, John of Antioch requested that the Emperor's edict of convocation should be read, whereupon Candidian went on with his account of what had taken place, and in answer to a fresh question of John's, declared that Nestorius had been condemned unheard. John found this quite in keeping with the disposition of the Synod, since, instead of receiving him and his companions in a friendly manner, they had rushed upon them tumultuously (it was thus that he described what had happened). *But the holy Synod, which was now assembled*, would decide what was proper with respect to them. And this Synod, of which John speaks in such grandiloquent terms, numbered only forty-three members, including himself, while on the other side there were more than two hundred.

John then proposed the question, what was to be decided respecting Cyril and his adherents; and several who were not particularly pronounced Nestorian bishops, came forward to relate how Cyril and Memnon of Ephesus had, from the beginning, maltreated the Nestorians, had allowed them no church, and even on the festival of Pentecost had permitted them to hold no service. Besides, Memnon had sent his clerics into the residences of the bishops, and had ordered them with threats to take part in his council. And in this way he and Cyril had confused everything, so that their own heresies might not be examined. Heresies, such as the Arian, the Apollinarian, and the Eunomian, were certainly contained in the last letter of Cyril (to Nestorius, along with the anathematisms). It was therefore John's duty to see to it that the heads of these heresies (Cyril and Memnon) should be suitably punished for such grave offences, and that the bishops

¹ *Epist. Synodi* in Mansi, t. iv. p. 1334; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1507.

who had been misguided by them should be subjected to ecclesiastical penalties.

To these impudent and false accusations John replied with hypocritical meekness, "that he had certainly wished that he should not be compelled to exclude from the Church any one who had been received into the sacred priesthood, but diseased members must certainly be cut off in order to save the whole body; and for this reason Cyril and Memnon deserved to be deposed, because they had given occasion to disorders, and had acted in opposition to the commands of the Emperors, and, besides, were in the chapters mentioned (the anathematisms) guilty of heresy. All who had been misled by them were to be excommunicated until they confessed their error, anathematized the heretical propositions of Cyril, adhered strictly to the creed of Nicæa, without any foreign addition, and joined the Synod of John."

The assembly approved of this proposal, and John then announced the sentence in the following manner:—

"The holy Synod, assembled in Ephesus, by the grace of God and the command of the pious Emperors, declares: We should indeed have wished to be able to hold a Synod in peace, but because you held a separate assembly from a heretical, insolent, and obstinate disposition, although we were already in the neighbourhood, and have filled both the city and the holy Synod with confusion, in order to prevent the examination of your Apollinarian, Arian, and Eunomian heresies, and have not waited for the arrival of the holy bishops of all regions, and have also disregarded the warnings and admonitions of Candidian, therefore shall you, Cyril of Alexandria, and you, Memnon of this place, know that you are deposed and dismissed from all sacerdotal functions, as the originators of the whole disorder, etc. You others, who gave your consent, are excommunicated, until you acknowledge your fault and reform, accept anew the Nicene faith (as if they had surrendered it!) without foreign addition, anathematize the heretical propositions of Cyril, and in all things comply with the command of the Emperors, who require a peaceful and more accurate consideration of the dogma."¹

¹ The Conciliabulum said nothing respecting Nestorius. Cyril and his friends

This decree was subscribed by all the forty-three members of the Conciliabulum: John of Antioch, Alexander of Apamea, and Alexander of Hierapolis; John, Metropolitan of Damascus; Dorotheus, Metropolitan of Marcianople; Dexianus, Metropolitan of Seleucia; Basilius, Metropolitan of Thessaly; Antiochus, Metropolitan of Bostra; Paulus, Bishop of Emesa; Apringius of Chalcis; Polychronius of Heraclea; Cyril of Adana; Ausonius of Himeria; Musæus of Aradus and Antaradus; Hesychius of Castabala; Salustius of Corycus; Jacobus of Dorostolus; Zosis of Isbuntis; Eustathius of Parnassus; Diogenes of Seleucobelus; Placon of Laodicæa; Polychronius of Epiphania; Fritilas, Metropolitan of Heraclea; Himerius, Metropolitan of Nicomedia; Eutherius, Metropolitan of Tyana; Asterius, Metropolitan of Amida; Theodore, the famous Bishop of Cyrus; Macarius, Bishop of Laodicæa Major; Theosebius of Cios, in Bithynia; Maximian, Metropolitan of Anazarbus; Gerontius, Bishop of Claudiopolis; Cyrus of Marcopolis; Aurelius of Irenopolis; Meletius of Neocæsarea; Helladius of Ptolemais; Tarianus (Trajanus) of Augusta; Valentinus of Mallus; Marcianus of Abrytus; Daniel of Faustinopolis; Julian of Larissa; Heliades of Zeugma; and Marcellinus of Arca.¹

The Conciliabulum then, in very one-sided letters,² informed the Emperor, the imperial ladies (the wife and sister of the Emperor Theodosius II.), the clergy, the senate, and the people of Constantinople, of all that had taken place, and a little later once more required the members of the genuine Synod, in writing, no longer to delay the time for repentance and conversion, and to separate themselves from Cyril and Memnon, etc., otherwise they would very soon be forced to lament their own folly.³

therefore accused the Antiochenes of being adherents of Nestorius. They certainly were so *negatively*, since they did not accept the sentence against Nestorius put forth by the Ephesine Synod. But they were not so *positively*, since they did not sanction the doctrine of Nestorius, and afterwards they agreed to his deposition. Cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. xiv. p. 415 sq.

¹ The Acts are given in Mansi, t. iv. p. 1259 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1447 sq. German (abridged) by Fuchs, *l.c.* Bd. iv. S. 92 ff.

² In Mansi, t. iv. pp. 1271-1280; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1458 sqq.

³ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1270; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1458.

On Saturday evening¹ the Conciliabulum asked Count Candidian to take care that neither Cyril nor Memnon, nor any one of their (excommunicated) adherents, should hold divine service on Sunday. Candidian now wished that no member of either synodal party should officiate, but only the ordinary clergy of the city; but Memnon declared that he would in no way submit to John and his Synod, and Cyril and his adherents held divine service.² All the efforts of John to appoint by force another bishop of Ephesus in the place of Memnon were frustrated by the opposition of the orthodox inhabitants.³

It is generally assumed that Candidian anticipated the legitimate Synod with his information, and did not allow their account to reach Constantinople. But this was not the case; for we see from a still extant letter of Dalmatius and other monks and clergy of Constantinople to the Synod,⁴ that the Emperor himself had sent them the letters which the Synod had addressed to them immediately after the deposition of Nestorius (see p. 54), and so he must also have received the account which had been addressed to him. Dalmatius asserts, at the same time, that all the people had approved of the deposition of Nestorius, and that the Emperor had expressed himself very favourably respecting the Synod. From this we perceive that at that time he had not yet received the account of Candidian. After the arrival of this a violent change immediately took place. The Emperor Theodosius now sent the Magistrian Palladius to Ephesus with a letter,⁵ setting forth "that he had learnt from Candidian that a part of the bishops had held a session without waiting for John of Antioch. Further, that not even all the bishops who were then present at Ephesus had taken part in this session, and that those who had done so had not discussed the dogma in the prescribed manner, but in a factious spirit. He therefore declared all that had been done to be invalid, and said

¹ If John arrived at Ephesus on Friday the 26th of June, then this Saturday was the next day. If, however, he arrived on the 27th, then that which is here related took place on the evening of the day on which he arrived.

² Mansi, t. v. p. 774 sq.

³ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1439; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1595.

⁴ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1431; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1590.

⁵ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1378 sq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1538 sq.

he would send a special official of the palace, who in conjunction with Candidian might examine what had taken place, and guard against all disorder for the future. In the meantime, and until the *collective* Synod should have discussed the dogma, no bishop was to leave the city of Ephesus, whether to proceed to the imperial court or to return home. The command should also be given to the governors of the several provinces not to allow any bishop who might return from Ephesus to remain at home. He (the Emperor) took no part on behalf of any man, and so not for Nestorius, but only for the truth and the doctrine." This letter bears date 3 Kal. Jul., that is, June 29. As, however, Cyril's answer relating to it, which was given to Palladius, was drawn up on July 1,¹ Palladius must have arrived in Ephesus before the end of June, and that date must have been a mistake of the writer. On the margin of the text, instead of *τριῶν καλανδῶν, δεκατριῶν* is put, that is, June 19, and many learned men have agreed to this suggestion; but Tillemont has properly drawn attention to the fact that the first session of the Synod, and the deposition of Nestorius, of which the Emperor speaks in this letter, did not take place until the 22d of June.²

John and his adherents naturally rejoiced at this imperial letter, and thought the world happy, as they say in their answer, to be under such rulers. They went on to say why they had been constrained to depose Cyril and the others, and did not disdain to allege as their chief reason, that these had ventured to attack the bishop of the imperial city, and had not obeyed the Emperor's commands. Their Conciliabulum they call a holy Synod, and pray that the Emperor will give order, that at the examination respecting the dogma, which is about to take place, each metropolitan shall take only two bishops with him, in order to paralyse the excessive number of bishops from Egypt and Asia Minor, of whom they thought they could not speak with sufficient contempt. After reading the Emperor's letter, they had wished, they said, to hold a thanksgiving service in S. John's Church, but the people had shut the doors against them, and had driven them to their

¹ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1422; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1582.

² Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. xiv. note 47, *Sur St. Cyrille*.

houses by force. The origin of all was Memnon, and the Emperor should therefore have him expelled from the city.¹

It is probable that the incident to which they refer had taken place on the attempt to appoint another bishop for Ephesus, since Memnon also mentions a tumult as having arisen on that occasion.²

In a second letter to the Emperor, they request that the Synod should be removed to another place, nearer to the court, where Cyril and his adherents might be convicted from his own writings.³

SEC. 136. *Letter of the Orthodox. Their Second Session, July 10.*

On the other hand, Cyril and his Synod also addressed a letter to the Emperors by the before-named Palladius, dated July 1, 431, setting forth that all that was necessary on the subject of Nestorius and his heresy had already been said in the reports and Acts of the first session, which they had sent. But Count Candidian preferred the friendship of Nestorius to piety, and therefore he had preoccupied the ears of the Emperors, and furnished one-sided reports. It would, however, be seen from the Acts of the Synod that they had acted against Nestorius without any partiality, and had carefully discussed the whole subject. The Emperors should therefore not listen to John of Antioch, who cared more for his friend than for the faith, and had allowed the Synod to wait for twenty-one days. After his arrival, however, he had immediately declared himself for Nestorius, whether from friendship, or because he shared his error. As Candidian prevented the Synod from sending to the Emperor an exact account of what had taken place, he could summon him, together with five members of the Synod, before him, and obtain intelligence from them by word of mouth. Recently, moreover, several bishops, who had hitherto been on the side of Nestorius, had

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1379 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1539 sqq.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1439; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1595.

³ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1386 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1546 sq.

come to take a better view of the matter, and had passed over to the Synod, so that now only about thirty-seven bishops remained with Nestorius and John, and these, for the most part, because they were afraid of punishment on account of offences committed, or because they were heretical, *e.g.* Pelagians. On the side of the Synod, on the contrary, was Bishop Cœlestine of Rome and the whole episcopate of Africa, although they were not personally present. Further, they touched slightly upon the acts of violence which Irenæus had permitted himself against the members of the Synod, and declared that on their side there were more than two hundred bishops, but that it was impossible to give a complete account because of the speedy return of Palladius.¹

About eight days later, July 10, Cyril arranged the second session of the Synod in the episcopal residence of Memnon, and he is again designated in the acts of these proceedings as representative of the Roman bishop.² The number of those present was the same as at the first session. The occasion for this second session, however, was given by the arrival of the legates sent by Pope Cœlestine to the Synod, Bishops Arcadius and Projectus, and the Presbyter Philip, who had to deliver the letter of the Pope, which has already been mentioned. It was first read in the original Latin text, and then in a Greek translation, and it pronounced in energetic language a commendation on the Synod, and exhorted them that they should tolerate no erroneous doctrines on the Person of Christ; that they should make their own the mind of the holy Evangelist John, whose relics were honoured in Ephesus; contend for the true faith, and maintain the peace of the Church. At the close the Pope said that he sent three deputies, that they might be present at the transactions, and carry out what he had already decided in reference to Nestorius, and that he did not doubt that the assembled bishops would agree with the same (see above, p. 42).

Notwithstanding that the papal claims were strongly expressed in the last sentence, the members of the Synod greatly

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1422 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1582 sqq. German by Fuchs, *l.c.* Bd. iv. S. 107.

² In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1279 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1465 sqq.

rejoiced at the Pope's letter, and exclaimed : " That is the true judgment, thanks to Cœlestine the new Paul, to Cyril the new Paul, to Cœlestine the watchman of the faith."

The papal legate Proiectus then directed closer attention to the contents of the papal letter, and especially to the point that the sentence which had already been delivered by the Pope should be carried into effect for the use of the Catholic Church, and in accordance with the rule of the Catholic faith ; that is, that all the bishops should accede to the papal sentence, and so raise it to the position of a judgment of the whole Church. In this matter, according to the Pope's opinion, the Synod had no longer to examine whether Nestorius taught error ; this was quite settled by the Roman sentence, and it was only incumbent upon the Synod to confirm this by their accession. The Synod had in their first session practically taken a different view, and had introduced a fresh examination as to the orthodoxy of Nestorius ;¹ nevertheless they now gave, partly in silence and partly expressly, their adhesion to the papal view, whilst Archbishop Firmus of Cæsarea, in Cappodocia, declared " that the former letter of the Apostolic See to Cyril had already contained the sentence and direction (ψῆφον καὶ τύπον) respecting the Nestorian question, and they (the assembled bishops) had, by ordering themselves accordingly, only fulfilled this direction, and pronounced the canonical and apostolic condemnation against Nestorius."²

One of the papal legates, the Presbyter Philip, who was rather more prominent than his colleagues, now thanked the Synod for this, " that the holy members had adhered to the holy head, knowing well that Peter was the head of the Catholic faith, and of all the apostles," and asked that the decisions of the Synod already adopted might be laid before them, so that the legates might confirm them (βεβαιώσωμεν), in accordance

¹ The *Katholik* (1872, S. 29) thinks that this examination of the doctrine of Nestorius was not intended to enlighten the Fathers as to its heretical character, as they had before declared Nestorius to be heretical, but that it was intended as an act of *approval*. But, in fact, the reading of the passages brought forward was intended to *prove* that Nestorius was heretical, and it was only after the reading of some of the passages that many Fathers exclaimed, " Anathema." See p. 47.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1287 sq. ; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1471.

with the commission of the Pope. This was agreed to, and the session then ended.¹

SEC. 137. *Third Session at Ephesus, July 11, 431.—Two Synodal Letters.*

The third session took place on the next day, July 11, and also in the residence of Memnon. The papal legates declared that they had in the meantime read the Acts of the first session, which had been given to them, and had found the judgment to be quite canonical and in accordance with ecclesiastical discipline; but, in compliance with the commission of the Pope, they must still request that the Acts of that session also should now be read again in their presence, which was then immediately done.

Thereupon each of the papal legates, the priest Philip again at their head, after a long introduction on the importance of the Pope, pronounced excommunication and deposition against Nestorius; and Cyril of Alexandria then remarked that they had thus spoken as representatives of the Pope and of the assembly of the Western Bishops. They could now sign the Acts of all the three sessions of the Synod already held, which they immediately did.² Philip is again foremost, whilst elsewhere he is often put in the third place.

All the bishops present then subscribed a synodal letter addressed to the Emperors, in which it was first related how, even before the opening of the Ephesine Synod, the Westerns had held a Council of their own in Rome, and had there rejected the doctrine of Nestorius. Pope Cœlestine had already communicated this in a letter, but now three legates had arrived from him, and had confirmed the sentence of Ephesus on Nestorius. Thus the whole of Christendom, with the exception of the few friends of Nestorius, had pronounced an unanimous judgment; consequently the Emperor should appoint that a new bishop should be given to the Church of Constantinople; and that the members of the Synod should be allowed to return home, as the long sojourn abroad was

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1290; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1474.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1299; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1482.

very inconvenient for many of them, that several had already fallen sick, and some had even died.¹ At the same time the Synod, in a second letter to the clergy and laity of Constantinople, expressed the hope that soon a worthy bishop might be found for the imperial city. Cyril subscribed in the first place, after him the Presbyter Philip of Rome, then Juvenal of Jerusalem, and then came the two other legates.²

SEC. 138. *Fourth Session at Ephesus, July 16, 431.*

Five days later, on July 16, the fourth session was celebrated, again in the great Church of S. Mary, and the Acts always place Cyril first, but as representative of the Pope. After him the three papal legates are named (the presbyter this time last), and next Juvenal and the rest. Cyril and Memnon had handed in a memorial, in which they briefly related the history both of the Synod and of the opposition Conciliabulum, denied to the latter the authority to condemn them, and concluded with the request that John of Antioch and his companions might be cited before the Synod, and called to an account.³ Immediately three bishops were sent to the Patriarch John to cite him; he did not, however, allow them admission, and they found his house surrounded by many armed men, who uttered insulting remarks respecting the Synod and the orthodox faith, and threatened the deputies.

When they had returned and communicated the intelligence to the Council, Cyril brought forward the proposal that, as John plainly had an evil conscience, and therefore did not come, the Synod should declare the judgment put forth by him against Cyril and Memnon as null, and pronounce a suitable punishment against him. Thereupon Juvenal of Jerusalem remarked that John should certainly have been present to show due reverence and submission to the apostolic see of great Rome and the apostolic Church of Jerusalem, especially as it was in accordance with apostolic order and tradition that the see of Antioch should be judged by the former. (A Greek

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1302; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1482.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1303; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1483.

³ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1306 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1486 sqq.

scholium is added to the text, to the effect that this must be understood of the Roman see, not of that of Jerusalem; for Rome had, even in the time of Paul of Samosata, and later, in that of Meletius, pronounced judgment concerning the see of Antioch.) Juvenal further proposed that the Patriarch John should be cited a second time by another deputation. The proposition was accepted, and three bishops were again sent. But neither were they admitted by John; but received for answer, that "he held no intercourse with deposed and excommunicated men."

At the repeated wish and motion of Cyril and Memnon the Synod therefore now declared: "The judgment which John and his companions have pronounced against Cyril and Memnon is uncanonical and altogether invalid. On the other hand, he must himself be cited for the third time before the holy Synod, and the Emperors must be made acquainted with all that has happened."¹

SEC. 139. *Fifth Session at Ephesus, July 17, 431, and Two Synodal Letters.*

On the very next day the bishops assembled for the fifth session. Cyril reported that John and his friends had in the meantime publicly circulated and posted up an insolent placard full of folly, containing the sentence of deposition against him and Memnon, and accusing them of Apollinarianism, Arianism, and Eunomianism. This accusation was wholly unfounded, for he and Memnon anathematized these and all other heresies, together with the new heretic Nestorius and his adherents. The Synod should now cite John and his friends for the third time, so that they might publicly prove their accusations (against Cyril and Memnon), or themselves be condemned, especially as they had conveyed false reports to the Emperors.—Again three bishops were sent, together with a notary, to John, in order to cite him for the third time, under a serious threat of canonical punishment in case of his non-appearance. They came to his residence, but instead of being received by him, his archdeacon was instructed to

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1310-1315; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1487 sq.

deliver to them a document with the words: "The holy Synod (that is, the Conciliabulum) sends this to you." It was probably nothing else but the decree of deposition of Cyril and Memnon already mentioned, and the deputies of the Synod declined to receive it. The archdeacon reported this to his master, and returned immediately with the document, declaring that the decisions (of the Conciliabulum) were already communicated to the Emperor, and they must therefore wait for further rules of procedure. When the deputies were about to deliver orally the commission of their Synod, the archdeacon sprang hastily away, saying, "You have not received the document, neither will I listen to the message of your Synod." The deputies, however, had the opportunity of making some of John of Antioch's priests acquainted with its contents, so that he might learn them in this way. Thereupon the Synod declared that they had reason to proceed in the most stringent manner against John and his companions, but that they preferred gentleness, and (not to depose, but only) to excommunicate them, and suspend them from all spiritual jurisdiction until they confessed their offences. If, however, they would not do this soon, then the stringent canonical sentence must be pronounced against them. At the same time, it was self-evident that all their decisions against Cyril and Memnon were wholly invalid. Finally, the Acts of this session also were to be transmitted to the Emperors.

The Synod mentioned all who were thus punished and threatened, particularly John of Antioch, John of Damascus, Alexander of Apamea, Dexianus of Seleucia, Alexander of Hierapolis, Himerius of Nicomedia, Fritilas of Heraclea, Helladius of Tarsus, Maximian of Anazarbus, Dorotheus of Marcanopolis, Peter of Trajanople, Paul of Emesa, Polychronius of Heraclea, Eutherius of Tyana, Meletius of Neocaesarea, Theodoret of Cyrus, Apringius of Chalcis, Macarius of Laodicea Major, Zosis of Esbuntis, Salustius of Corycus, Hesy chius of Castabala, Valentinus of Mutlubbaca (Mallus), Eustathius of Parnassus, Philip of Theodosianopolis, Daniel, Julian, Cyril, Olympius, Diogenes, Palladius (these without names of places), Theophanes of Philadelphia, Trajanus of Augusta, Aurelius of Irenopolis, Musaeus of Arcadiopolis, and

Helladius of Ptolemais.¹ They are altogether thirty-five bishops, and a comparison of their names with those forty-three who subscribed the decree of the first session of the Conciliabulum shows that this party had certainly won a few new adherents, but had lost considerably more, a fact which, as we know, had been before maintained by Cyril.

The Synod immediately reported what had taken place, both to the Emperors and to the Pope, and we are still in possession of these documents, which are not without value. In the letter to the Emperors it is related that the Synod had deposed Nestorius, but that his friends had won over John of Antioch, and in union with him, although only thirty in number (the letter to Pope Celestine says "about thirty"), had held a spurious Synod, whilst the Emperors had expressly required only one, and that a general Synod, to be held. Among the members of the spurious Synod were many who had not yet purged themselves of offences of which they had been accused, and even John of Antioch had feared lest he should be called to account for his long absence from the Synod.² And this spurious Synod, without observing any regular order of proceeding, without accusers, and without citation, had, in a manner wholly uncanonical and unjust, declared Cyril and Memnon deposed, and had endeavoured by false representations to deceive the Emperors. The true and only Synod had therefore three times cited John of Antioch and his companions, that they might bring forward their complaints against Cyril and Memnon. They had not appeared, and therefore their resolutions against Cyril and Memnon had been declared invalid, and they themselves had been placed under excommunication until they should be reformed. The Emperors should certainly not regard that conventicle of sinners as a Synod. Even at Nicæa a small minority had separated itself from the Synod of 318 bishops, but these men were in no way regarded as a Council by Constantine the Great; on

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1318-1326; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1493-1500. German in Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 135 ff.

² In the imperial edict of convocation it was said that whoever should not be at Ephesus by Pentecost, should be in a high degree responsible before God and the Emperors. See above, p. 40.

the contrary, they were punished. It would be in the highest degree absurd that thirty persons should set themselves in opposition to a Synod of two hundred and ten holy bishops, with whom, moreover, the whole Western episcopate was united. And, besides, there were among those thirty several who had been previously deposed, several Pelagians and Nestorians.¹ The Emperors should therefore confirm and give effect to what the holy and Œcumenical Synod had decided against Nestorius and his impious doctrine.²

Still more complete is the synodal letter to Pope Cœlestine, and it contains a complete history of the Ephesine Council from the imperial edict of convocation to the results of the fifth session, with the remark that the Synod had declared Cyril and Memnon to be quite innocent, and maintained the closest communion with them. Much more important is the addition, that in the Ephesine Synod (although we are not informed in what session) the Western Acts on the condemnation of the Pelagians and Celestians, of Pelagius, Cœlestius, and his adherents, Julianus, Persidius, Florus, Marcellinus, and Orentius, etc., were read, and the papal judgment on them universally approved.³

As before against Nestorius, so now Cyril preached also against John of Antioch, and we possess still a beautiful and very powerful discourse on that subject.⁴ If it has some strong expressions of an abusive character, it is still moderate in comparison with what John had allowed himself to say against Cyril.

¹ In the letter to the Pope, to be noticed presently, the Synod adds, that "many of these so-called bishops had no churches, others had been expelled from Thessaly" (perhaps Italy).

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1326 sq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1502 sqq.

³ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1330-1333; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1503-1510. The words relating to the Pelagians are the following: Ἀναγνωσθέντων δὲ ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων τῶν απραγμίων ἐπὶ τῇ καθαιρέσει τῶν ἀνοσιῶν Πιλαγιανῶν καὶ Κελιστιανῶν, Κελιστίου, Πιλαγίου, Ἰουλιανίου, Περσιδίου, Φλώρου, Μαρκελλίνου, Ὀρεντίου, καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ τούτοις φρονούντων, ἰδικαιώσαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἰσχυρὰ καὶ βίβαια μείναι τὰ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἁρισμῖνα παρὰ τῆς σῆς Θεοσεβείας· καὶ σύμφηφοι πάντες ἵσμεν, καθηρημένους ἔχοντες αὐτούς.

⁴ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1338 sqq.

SEC. 140. *Sixth Session at Ephesus, July 22, 431.*

On the 22d of July the sixth session of the Synod was held in the residence of Memnon,¹ and on that occasion the Nicene Creed was first read, and then again all those passages from the Fathers which had been brought forward at the condemnation of Nestorius in the first session. This was done in proof that the Nestorians had not correctly comprehended and explained the Nicene formula.

Then Charisius, a cleric (Economus) of the Church of Philadelphia, gave the information that two priests from Constantinople, Anastasius and Photius, had sent a certain Jacobus provided with letters of introduction to the Bishops of Lydia, and had commended his orthodoxy. This Jacobus had come to Philadelphia, and had soon misled some clerics, and induced them to sign another Nestorian Creed instead of the Nicene. As, now, many Quartodecimans in Lydia wished to return again to the Church, they had also allured these to subscribe a heretical Creed, instead of the Nicene. He (Charisius), because of his opposition, had been declared a heretic by the others, and excommunicated, but he was thoroughly orthodox, and could prove this by his creed, which he laid before them. This was, in meaning, entirely accordant with the Niceno-Constantinopolitan, and in words almost identical.² He also brought forward the falsified creed in question, and there is no doubt that this, under inflated language and apparent zeal for orthodoxy, contained the fundamental Nestorian error—the dividing of Christ into the Logos and an assumed man.³ The creed was not composed by Nestorius himself, but by Theodore of Mopsuestia,⁴ but it had been circulated by the Nestorians, and the copy which Charisius presented was subscribed by many former Quartodecimans and some Novatians, almost all

¹ The Acts of this session are no longer preserved entire in Greek (Mansi, t. iv. p. 1342 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1520 sqq.); but we possess several Latin translations and extracts in Mansi, t. v. p. 602 sqq., and the still more complete Latin translation of Marius Mercator, *ibid.* p. 686 sqq.

² In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1347; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1515.

³ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1347 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1515 sqq. German in Fuchs, l.c. S. 143 ff. Partly in *Tübing. theol. Quartalschr.* 1835, S. 242 ff.

⁴ Cf. Walch, *Ketzergesch.* Bd. v. S. 354.

laymen of different ranks. Still there was among them a Quartodeciman priest, named Patricius, who could not write.¹

The Synod now gave order, under pain of excommunication and deposition, that no other than the Nicene Creed, particularly not that presented by Charisius, should be used, and had the well-known extracts, of the first session, from the writings of Nestorius read again, after which all who were present, and Cyril first, subscribed the Acts.

SEC. 141. *Seventh Session at Ephesus. Circular Letter and Canons.*

It is doubtful when the seventh and last session was held. The Acts name the 31st of August, but Garnier,² and after him many scholars of distinction, have supposed that there was a mistake of the writer at this point, and have pronounced for the 31st of July, for this reason, that the new imperial commissioner, John, reached Ephesus at the beginning of August, and no more sessions were held after his arrival.³ This seventh session again took place in the Church of S. Mary, and began with the reading of a petition given in by Rheginus, Archbishop of Constantia, in Cyprus, and signed by him and the two other Cypriote bishops, Zeno and Evagrius. For some time the Patriarchs of Antioch had claimed rights of superiority over the Bishops of Cyprus, particularly the right of ordination, etc. When the metropolitan chair of this island was, by the death of Troilus, again left empty, at the time of the convocation of the Synod of Ephesus, the Proconsul of Antioch, Duke Dionysius, at the request of the Antiochene patriarch, forbade the election of a new archbishop before the pending controversy should be decided by the Synod. If, however, contrary to his expectation, a bishop for Constantia should be elected, he must appear at the Synod at Ephesus.—The

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1358 ; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1523.

² In his edition of the works of Marius Mercator, in the preface to Pars ii. p. 729, édit. Migne.

³ Dupin, *Nouvelle Biblioth.* t. iv. p. 300 ; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. xiv. p. 444, édit. Venise ; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* liv. xxv. § 57 ; Remi Ceillier, *Histoire des Auteurs Sacrés*, t. xiii. p. 746 ; Walch, *Ketzergesch.* Bd. v. S. 511 f.

two letters of the proconsul, on this subject, to the President of Cyprus and to the clergy of Constantia, were appended to the petition, and read at the same time with it. The Bishops of Cyprus, however, had paid no regard to this prohibition, and had chosen as archbishop Rheginus, who has already been mentioned (according to their custom), in their provincial Synod, because, as they explained at Ephesus, those pretensions of Antioch were *contra apostolicos canones et definitiones sanctissimæ Nicænæ Synodi*.¹ That by *apostolici canones* they meant a pseudo-apostolic, and, in particular, No. 36, has already been noticed in vol. i. p. 454 f. In reference to the canons of Nicæa, however, they evidently had in view canon 4, which says: "The bishop shall be appointed by all (the bishops) of the province" (vol. i. p. 381). In the debate which arose at Ephesus, on the application of the Cypriotes, it was remarked by several, "that it ought not to be forgotten that the Synod of Nicæa had preserved its own dignity for every church, and this ought especially to be remembered at Antioch."² The speakers here unmistakably referred to the sixth Nicene canon, and meant to say that "this canon confirmed to the great patriarchal sees, and among them to Antioch, their ancient rights. Therefore the question must be put in this form: How was it in earlier times? Did the Antiochene bishops possess and exercise the right in earlier times of consecrating the Cypriote bishops or not?" The Synod thereupon required of the Cypriote bishops to prove that Antioch had no such ancient rights over them, and one of them, Zeno by name, certified on this point, that the late Archbishop Troilus of Cyprus, and all his predecessors, back to the apostolic times, had always been ordained by the bishops of their own province, and never by the Bishop of Antioch. Thereupon the Synod drew up the resolution, "That the churches of Cyprus should be confirmed in their independence, and in their right to consecrate (and elect) their own bishops; that the liberties of all ecclesiastical provinces generally should be renewed, and all intrusions into foreign provinces forbidden."³

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1465; Hardouin, t. i. p. 167.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1468; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1620.

³ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1466-1470; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1617-1620; Fuchs, *l.c.*

In the same session the Synod also sent forth a circular letter to all bishops, clergy, and laity, to the effect that they had pronounced excommunication and suspension from all spiritual jurisdiction against John of Antioch and his adherents, who were mentioned by name. To this general proclamation they appended the following six canons:—

CANON 1.

Εἴ τις ὁ μητροπολίτης τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἀποστατήσας τῆς ἁγίας καὶ οἰκουμενικῆς Συνόδου, προσέθετο τῷ τῆς ἀποστασίας συνεδρίῳ, ἢ μετὰ τοῦτο προστεθείη, ἢ τὰ Κελεστίου ἐφρόνησεν ἢ φρονήσῃ, οὗτος κατὰ τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπων διαπράττεσθαι τι οὐδαμῶς δύναται, πάσης ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κοινωνίας ἐντεῦθεν ἥδη ὑπὸ τῆς Συνόδου ἐκβεβλημένος, καὶ ἀνενέργητος ὑπάρχων· ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοῖς τοῖς τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόποις καὶ τοῖς περίξ μητροπολίταις τοῖς τὰ τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας φρονοῦσιν ὑποκεύεται, εἰς τὸ πάντη καὶ τοῦ βαθμοῦ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐκβληθῆναι.

If a metropolitan has separated himself from this holy and Œcumenical Synod, and has joined that assembly of apostates (the Conciliabulum), or shall hereafter join them, or has agreed with Cœlestius (= the Pelagians), or shall agree, he has no more jurisdiction over the bishops of his province, and is already (by the previous sentence on John and his adherents) excluded and suspended by the Synod from all church communion. It is further the duty of the bishops of the province themselves, and the neighbouring metropolitans, who are orthodox, to see to his total deposition from the episcopate.

CANON 2.

Εἰ δέ τις ἐπαρχιώται ἐπίσκοποι ἀπελείφθησαν τῆς ἁγίας Συνόδου, καὶ τῇ ἀποστασίᾳ προστετέθησαν, ἢ προστεθῆναι πειραθεῖεν, ἢ καὶ ὑπογράψαντες τῇ Νεστορίου καθαιρέσει ἐπαλινδρόμησαν πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἀποστασίας συνέδριον, τούτους πάντη

S. 149-153. Cf., on the Cypriote controversy, also Maassen, *Der Primat des Bischofs von Rom*, S. 50 ff.

κατὰ τὸ δόξαν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Συνόδῳ ἁλλοτρίους εἶναι τῆς ἱερωσύνης καὶ τοῦ βαθμοῦ ἐκπίπτειν.

If any provincial bishops (ἐπαρχιωται = the suffragan bishops of a province, cf. Suicer, *Thesaurus*, s.v.) were not present at the holy Synod, but passed over to the apostates (the Antiochenes), or attempted to pass over, or if they signed the deposition of Nestorius, but then went over to the assembly of apostates, these shall be entirely deposed from the holy priesthood, and shall be deprived of their degree (office).

CANON 3.

Εἰ δέ τινες καὶ τῶν ἐν ἐκάστῃ πόλει ἢ χώρα κληρικῶν ὑπὸ Νεστορίου καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντων τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐκωλύθησαν διὰ τὸ ὀρθῶς φρονεῖν, ἐδικαιώσαμεν καὶ τούτους τὸν ἴδιον ἀπολαβεῖν βαθμόν· κοινῶς δὲ τοὺς τῇ ὀρθοδόξῳ καὶ οἰκουμενικῇ Συνόδῳ συμφρονούντας κληρικούς, κελεύομεν τοῖς ἀποστατήσασιν ἢ ἀφισταμένοις ἐπισκόποις μὴ θ' ὕλως ὑποκεῖσθαι κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον.

If any of the clergy in any town or in the country have been deposed by Nestorius or his adherents on account of their orthodoxy, they shall receive their office again. Generally, all clerics who adhere to the orthodox and Œcumenical Synod shall in no way be subject to the apostate or apostatizing bishops.

CANON 4.

Εἰ δέ τινες ἀποστατήσαιεν τῶν κληρικῶν, καὶ τολμήσαιεν ἢ κατ' ἰδίαν ἢ δημοσίᾳ τὰ Νεστορίου ἢ τὰ Κελεστίου φρονῆσαι, καὶ τούτους εἶναι καθηρημένους ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας Συνόδου δεδικαίωται.

If any of the clergy shall apostatize, and either privately or publicly hold with Nestorius or Cœlestius, the Synod decides that they also shall be deposed.

CANON 5.

Ὅσοι ἐπὶ ἀτόποις πράξεσι κατεκρίθησαν ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας

Συνόδου ἢ ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκείων ἐπισκόπων, καὶ τούτοις ἀκανονίστως κατὰ τὴν ἐν ἅπασιν ἀδιαφορίαν αὐτοῦ ὁ Νεστόριος, καὶ οἱ τὰ αὐτοῦ φρονοῦντες, ἀποδοῦναι ἐπειράθησαν ἢ πειραθεῖεν κοινωρίαν ἢ βαθμόν, ἀνωφελήτους μένειν καὶ τούτους, καὶ εἶναι οὐδὲν ἡττον καθηρημένους ἐδικαιώσαμεν.

Those who have been condemned on account of improper actions, either by the holy Synod or by their own bishops, and whom Nestorius and his adherents, uncanonically, and without making any distinction between that which is allowed and forbidden,¹ have attempted, or shall attempt, to restore to communion or to their office, shall derive no advantage from this, but shall remain deposed.

CANON 6.

Ὅμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινας βουλευθεῖεν τὰ περὶ ἐκάστων πεπραγμένα ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Συνόδῳ τῇ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ οἰφδύποτε τρίτῳ παρασαλεύειν ἢ ἁγία Σύνοδος ὥρρισεν, εἰ μὲν ἐπίσκοποι εἶεν ἢ κληρικοί, τοῦ οἰκείου παντελῶς ἀποπίπτειν βαθμοῦ· εἰ δὲ λαϊκοί, ἀκοινωνήτους ὑπάρχειν.

Generally, with respect to those who may, in any way whatever, resist any of the enactments of the holy Synod at Ephesus, the Synod decrees, if they are bishops or clerics, that they shall be entirely deprived of their office, but if they are laymen they shall be excommunicated.

The Acts add, besides, that these canons were subscribed by all the bishops.² When, however, in several manuscripts, eight Ephesine canons are numbered, this arises from the fact that the resolution of the Synod in the matter of Charisius is put down as the seventh canon, and the decree respecting the Cypriote bishops as the eighth.³

It is worthy of note that Dionysius Exiguus does not receive a single canon of all those of Ephesus into his collec-

¹ This is the comment of the old scholiast Zonaras on this passage. See Beverg. *Synodicon*, t. i. p. 102.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1471 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1622 sqq.; Fuchs, S. 153 ff. Beveridge gives a commentary on some of the Ephesine canons, *Synodicon*, t. ii. Appendix, p. 103 sqq.

³ Mansi, Hardouin, and Fuchs, *U. cc.*

tion, perhaps because these have no *general* bearing, but only contain such decisions as have a *special* application to the Nestorian and Pelagian questions.

SEC. 142. *The Affairs of Pamphylia, the Massalians, Thrace, and the See of Jerusalem.*

That the Synod of Ephesus considered several other special subjects, is shown by various documents which have been preserved, only we do not know to what session they belonged. At the head of them stands the letter to the provincial Synod in Pamphylia with reference to Bishop Eustathius. This man¹ (whether Metropolitan of Pamphylia or Bishop of Attalia is doubtful) had resigned, because he could not properly preside over his diocese and hold his opponents in check. In his place a certain Theodorus was appointed by the other bishops of the province; but, in agreement with his successor, Eustathius petitioned the Synod for permission to be allowed to retain the title and rank of bishop; and the Synod granted him this, with the limitation, that he should undertake no ordinations, and that he should never of his own authority hold service without consent of the bishop.²

The second document belonging to this subject is a decree in reference to the *Massalians* or *Euchites*. The Bishops of Pamphylia and Lycaonia, in whose districts these heretics dwelt, presented a decree respecting them adopted by the Council of Constantinople under Bishop Sisinnius, and our Synod confirmed it, as well as that which was done in this matter at Alexandria. According to this decree, clerics who had been hitherto Massalians, but now anathematized this heresy, were to remain among the clergy, and laymen were to be admitted

¹ In the superscription of the synodal letter he is called metropolitan; but the two metropolitan sees of Pamphylia, Perga and Side, were then occupied by Berinian and Amphilochius (cf. the signatures of the bishops present at Ephesus, in Mansi, t. iv. p. 1214 and 1226; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1423 and 1431); on the other hand, we find among the Fathers of the Ephesine Synod a Theodore of Attalia, and Tillenont has suggested (note 55, *Sur St. Cyrille*) that this was the successor of Eustathius.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1475; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1626. Cf. Hergenröther, *Photius*, etc., Bd. ii. S. 339.

to communion. If, however, they declined to anathematize their previous error, then the clergy were to lose office, dignity, and church communion, and the laity to be anathematized. Moreover, those who were proved to be Massalians (even if they repented) were to have no monasteries allowed them, so that this creed (which was quite at home in monasteries) should not spread farther. Finally, anathema was pronounced upon a writing of these heretics, their *Asceticon*.¹

For a third decree two Thracian bishops, Euprepilus of Biza (Bizya) and Cyril of Coele, gave occasion, praying for protection against their metropolitan, Fritilas of Heraclea, who had gone over to the party of John of Antioch, and at the same time for the confirmation of the previous practice of holding two bishoprics at the same time. The Synod granted both.²

Finally, we also know, from a letter of Pope Leo the Great, that at the Synod of Ephesus Bishop Juvenal of Jerusalem endeavoured, among other things, dishonestly and by the presentation of false documents, to get quite free from the patriarchal authority of the Bishop of Antioch, and to gain the ecclesiastical primacy over Palestine for his own see;³ but that Cyril of Alexandria, although closely united with Juvenal on the main point, the struggle against Nestorius and the Antiochenes, yet earnestly opposed this intrigue, and subsequently reported it to the Pope.⁴

SEC. 143. *Both Parties at Ephesus appeal to the Emperor.*

As we saw, the Synod had resolved repeatedly, and in every session, to send their Acts to the Emperor, but they had complained, even at the time when Palladius arrived at Ephesus, that Count Candidian had not allowed their reports to reach

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1477; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1627. Cf. Tillemont, t. xiv. note 56, *Sur St. Cyrille*.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1478; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1628.

³ From a letter of the Antiochene deputies (see § 148) we see that Juvenal also laid claim to Phœnicia and Arabia.

⁴ Cf. on this subject our commentary on the seventh Nicene canon, in vol. i. p. 404 ff., and what was said there (p. 393) on the extent of the Patriarchate of Antioch.

the Emperor. Similar and still more wanton acts of violence in this direction had been performed by the Nestorians in Constantinople itself. They had taken possession of the highways and gates, and visited all the ships, in order to prevent any communication between the Synod and the capital. In spite of this a beggar at last succeeded in smuggling in a letter, which is now lost, concealed in a hollow stick, from Cyril to the bishops and monks of Constantinople, in which the oppression of the Synod by Candidian and the Orientals was described, and a request made that they might be allowed to send bishops as deputies to Constantinople.¹ Deeply moved by this letter, the monks of Constantinople, with their archimandrites and specially Dalmatius at the head of them, marched, with singing of hymns and psalms, in front of the imperial residence. For eight-and-forty years Dalmatius, who enjoyed a great reputation for sanctity, could in no way be induced to leave his monastery; but now he believed that he was summoned by a heavenly voice to save the Church, and his sudden appearance made a great impression.² The Emperor permitted the archimandrites to come into his presence, while the crowd of monks and the people waited in the meantime singing sacred songs before the gates. The archimandrites read the letter which they had received from Ephesus before the Emperor, and the following conversation arose. The Emperor said: "If this is so, some of the bishops (of the Synod) must come to me and represent their case." Dalmatius answered: "None of them dares to come hither." To which the Emperor replied: "No one hinders them." Dalmatius: "Yes, they are hindered. Many who belong to the Nestorian party come and go without the least hindrance; but no one dares to give your Piety intelligence of what the holy Synod does." He added: "Will you

¹ That the last point was contained in this letter, is clear from the *Apologia Dalmatic*. (τοῦτο οὖν ἐγίνετο, ἵνα πεμφθῇ, καὶ ἔλθωσιν οἱ ἐρχόμενοι . . . οἱ ἀγιώτατοι ἱερίσκοι, οἱ νῦν ἐρχόμενοι παρὰ τῆς ἁγίας συνόδου), Mansi, t. iv. p. 1429; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1588 sq.

² Before this, as he indicates himself (Mansi, Hardouin, *ll. cc.*), he had advised the Emperor, when the latter visited him, how he should write to Ephesus. The Emperor appeared at first disposed to agree with his advice, but was turned from it by means of an intrigue, and then wrote what Palladius arranged (see above, p. 59).

rather hear six thousand bishops (the whole of orthodox Christendom) or a single impious man (Nestorius)?” The Emperor now gave permission for the envoys of the Synod to come to Constantinople, and in conclusion asked the archimandrites for their prayers to God. The archimandrites, retiring from the imperial palace, with the monks and people, went into the Church of S. Mocius the martyr, where Dalmatius ascended the pulpit and gave an account of what had happened, whereupon all present shouted out, “Anathema to Nestorius!”¹ Making use of the imperial permission, perhaps even before this arrived at Ephesus, the Synod sent Bishops Theopemptus of Cabasus and Daniel of Darnis (two Egyptians) to Constantinople² with a letter of thanks to Dalmatius.³

But John and his Orientals also found it necessary to use influence at court. Out of obedience to the imperial command, however, they would not, as they said,⁴ like the Egyptians, send bishops, but requested Count Irenæus, the zealous friend of Nestorius, to go on their behalf to Constantinople. He was quite ready, and took a letter from the Schismatics with him, in which they informed the Emperor how they had not been allowed to hold divine service in Ephesus; how, shortly after the arrival of Palladius, when they wished to go into a church to return thanks to God for the letter received from the Emperor, they had been maltreated; and how Cyril and his

¹ The documents referring to these events are in Mansi, t. iv. p. 1427 and 1430; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1586 sqq. Some historians refer this occurrence to a somewhat later period, when Cyril and Memnon were already arrested, and the need of the Synod had become greater. But the documents just referred to give not the slightest hint that the arrest had as yet taken place, and that which Dalmatius requested, namely, the admission of envoys from the Synod, followed about the same time, when Irenæus went to Constantinople, and a considerable time *before* the arrival of Count John, and *before* the arrest of Cyril and Memnon. Cf. Walch, *Ketzergesch.* v. S. 522.

² Their names are, indeed, never definitely mentioned, but they may be inferred from the fact that these two bishops, who were among those who previously subscribed at Ephesus, are from this time mentioned as being present at Constantinople.

³ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1258; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1447. Frequently, but erroneously, the letter, which we still possess, from Dalmatius to the Synod (Mansi, t. iv. p. 1258; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1446), is referred to this time. It is evidently *later*, and mentions *earlier* services which Dalmatius rendered to the Council.

⁴ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1374; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1535.

adherents had allowed themselves in all kinds of acts of violence.¹ The Emperor therefore should listen to Irenæus, who transmitted several proposals from their side, with the view of putting an end to the evil.²

As it is not mentioned in this letter that the Synod had already pronounced sentences of excommunication and suspension on the Schismatics, it appears that it was composed before the fourth and fifth sessions of the Synod (July 16 and 17), so that Irenæus must have departed about the middle of July.

After, however, the Synod in those two sessions had pronounced judgment on John of Antioch and his adherents, these last immediately prepared an account of this also for the Emperor, and sent it after Irenæus, who had already departed, that he might deliver it to the Emperor at the same time. In this they attempt to prove that their judgment on Cyril and Memnon is valid, and, on the other hand, that of the Synod upon them foolish and impotent; they complain again of oppressions, and request that they may be summoned to Constantinople or Nicomedia (to a new Synod), for the sake of a more careful examination. But orders should be given (as they had proposed before) that no metropolitan should bring more than two bishops to this Synod. Finally, they asked the Emperor to give orders that every one should subscribe the Nicene Creed, which they themselves placed at the head of their letter,³ that no one should add anything new, that no one should call Christ a mere man (as Nestorius), and that no one should declare the Godhead of Christ to be capable of suffering (which was brought as a reproach

¹ Thus each side complained of the misdeeds of the other. Both might have occasion for this. The possessors of power on the side of the Schismatics (Candidian, etc.) oppressed the Synod; the people of Ephesus, on the other hand, threatened and insulted the Schismatics.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1390; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1547.

³ In our copies the letter of the Antiochenes no longer has the Nicene Creed. Garnier and others believed, therefore, that the document with the superscription *De Schismaticis*, which is printed in Mansi, t. iv. p. 1375, and in Hardouin, t. i. p. 1535, and contains the Nicene Creed, was originally a portion of the letter of the Antiochenes in question. This is not so. That document is evidently later, for there is a reference in it to the third imperial letter, which Count John conveyed.

against Cyril), for both these statements were quite sacrilegious.¹ At the same time the Schismatics addressed letters to some high state officials, in order to represent to them their sad condition in Ephesus, and the bad treatment which they experienced, with the petition that they would assist in having them summoned to Constantinople, and in obtaining the holding of a new Synod.² To this time certainly belongs also the letter of Theodoret of Cyrus to Andreas, Bishop of Samosata, which we now possess only in Latin, and in which he congratulates him that sickness prevented his coming to Ephesus. In this way he has not been forced to behold their sorrow and misery. The Egyptian, he says, rages against God, and the greatest part of the people of God are on his side, the Egyptians, the Palestinians, those from Pontus and Asia, and the Westerns. The deposed men (Cyril and the others) held divine service, while those who deposed them had to sit lamenting at home. Never had writer of comedy composed such a laughable story, or a writer of tragedy such a sorrowful play.³

The envoys of the genuine Synod arrived at Constantinople three days before Irenæus, as the latter himself relates, and by their representation of the true state of affairs, made a powerful impression on many persons of high rank, statesmen and generals, so that these recognized the sentence of the Synod on Nestorius as perfectly just. This view was adopted particularly by the chamberlain Scholasticus, especially for this reason, that Nestorius had at Ephesus opposed the expression "God-bearer."⁴ After the arrival of Irenæus, several

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1371 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1534 sqq.

² In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1383 and 1386; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1543. The last of these two letters to the Præpositus and the Scholasticus seems, besides, to have been composed somewhat later, after the arrival of Count John; for there is a reference there, as in the note above, to *three* letters of the Emperor.

³ In Theodoret's *Opp.* ed. Schulze, t. iv. p. 1335, and more complete, t. v. p. 649. See also the remarks of Garnier, *ibid.* p. 368. Further, in Mansi, t. v. p. 787, and t. ix. p. 293, and Hardouin, t. iii. p. 136, under the Acts of the fifth Œcumenical Council, collat. v.

⁴ Nestorius wrote to him somewhat later, in order to gain his favour again, and explained in what sense he consented to call Mary God-bearer. At the same time he misrepresented the doctrine of Cyril, as if the latter ascribed a beginning in time and death to the divine nature of Christ, Mansi, t. v. p. 777; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1552.

interviews and discussions were brought about between the adherents of the two parties, and they came to an agreement that Irenæus and the deputies of the Synod should appear together, and in the presence of the highest officers of state, before the Emperor. Irenæus declares that he was unable to get as far as the palace without incurring the danger of being thrown into the sea (so greatly were the people enraged against the Nestorians), but boasts of his having succeeded in convincing the Emperor of the injustice of the Synod, and its disorderly conduct (in not having waited for the Antiochenes), and of having persuaded him to resolve on the deposition of Cyril, and to declare what had been done by the majority at Ephesus as invalid. Soon afterwards, however, he said, John the physician and Syncellus (secretary) of Cyril had arrived in Jerusalem, and had overthrown the structure of Irenæus, and won over again many of the high officials. One party now advised that the Emperor should confirm the depositions which had proceeded from both sides, and thus, on the one side, that of Nestorius, and, on the other, that of Cyril and Memnon; a second party, on the contrary, advised that the Emperor should agree to neither of these depositions, but rather should call together the most eminent bishops to examine what had been done. A third advice was to the effect that the Emperor should send commissioners to Ephesus, in order to restore peace again. This last proposal was the least acceptable of all to Irenæus, as it proceeded from a side which was unfriendly to Nestorius.¹

SEC. 144. *Resolution of the Emperor. Arrest of Cyril, Memnon, and Nestorius. Distress of the Synod.*

The Emperor, in fact, united the first and second proposals, confirmed the deposition as well of Nestorius as of Cyril and Memnon, and at the same time sent one of the highest officers of State, the *Comes Sacrorum* (= *sacrarum largitionum* = treasurer of state) John, to Ephesus, to publish the sentence, and to effect a union of the separated bishops. The

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1391 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1547 sqq.

edict in which he announced this decree¹ was addressed to all those archbishops and prominent bishops who had previously received special invitations to the Synod of Ephesus, and probably through an error of the chancery there is still found among them the name of Augustine, who had died eleven months before (August 28, 430). The first among all the bishops united in the superscription of the edict is Pope Cœlestine, although he was not personally present at Ephesus; the names of Cyril and Memnon, and on the other side of Nestorius, are, however, for obvious reasons passed over. Whether John of Antioch is specially named is doubtful. There are certainly two Johns mentioned without more particular description, but neither of them is placed immediately after Pope Cœlestine, which the hierarchical order would have required if John of Antioch were intended. As, however, this order is not strictly maintained in the superscription, and, for example, Juvenal of Jerusalem is mentioned only in the eighteenth place, and after bishops who were decidedly inferior to him in rank, this argument again loses its force.

That the Emperor pronounced a sentence of deposition on S. Cyril need not surprise us, for he was himself destitute of all necessary insight into the whole theological question, otherwise he could not have taken under his protection first Nestorius, and then, as we shall see, at a later period his opposite Eutyches. The Antiochenes, however, even the highly meritorious and orthodox men among them, like Theodoret of Cyrus, had done all in their power to convict Cyril's doctrine of Apollinarianism, and his conduct of injustice and passionateness. They said: As his uncle Theophilus persecuted S. Chrysostom from private hatred, so does Cyril act towards Nestorius. He stamps him as a heretic in order to ruin him.

Accusations of this kind had, to a certain extent, prevailed even with orthodox theologians, as we see from the letters of the holy Abbot Isidore of Pelusium (near Alexandria) to Cyril,² in which it is said quite distinctly that these com-

¹ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1395; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1554.

² Isidor. Pelus. lib. i. epist. 310, 323, 370; Baron. *ad ann.* 431, n. 85; Mansi, t. v. p. 758, where thirteen Latin letters of Isidore are printed.

plaints had proceeded from the Antiochene party at Ephesus. What wonder if the never very powerful-minded Emperor Theodosius II. was led into error, especially as his commissioner, Candidian, was in entire agreement with the Antiochenes. His edict has, however, a more extensive side, which deserves special attention. After the cunning manner of diplomatists, the true state of the matter is ignored, that is, the actual existence of two opposing Synods at Ephesus. The matter is represented as though the whole of the bishops present at Ephesus, united in one Council, had on the one side deposed Nestorius, and on the other Cyril and Memnon, and as though they were quite agreed as to the orthodox faith, so that nothing more remained to be done but to appease some still existing enmities, and then to separate in peace. To this peace the Emperor not only himself exhorted the Synod, but he also sent to it at the same time a letter directed to the same end from the more than centenarian Bishop Acacius of Beroëa (now Aleppo), in Syria, a man held in the highest esteem, who was unable to come in person to the Synod, but who wished to send to it his counsel and his opinion.

With this letter of the Emperor and that of Bishop Acacius, the new commissioner, John, proceeded to Ephesus, and, as is universally admitted, arrived there at the beginning of August.¹ There was great fear that the cause of orthodoxy was in danger, but Cyril endeavoured to lay this apprehension to rest by a sermon preached probably before the bishops of the Synod, in which he pointed out that persecutions always contributed to the wellbeing of the righteous.² In the superscription of this sermon it is remarked that he delivered it before his arrest, and that this was ordered by the new commissioner, Count John, who thus informed the Emperor

¹ Irenæus, as we have seen, had arrived at Constantinople on the 20th of July. The conferences between him and his opponents, and before the Emperor, may have lasted until towards the end of the month of July. The consequence of them was the despatch of Count John; and since the latter, as he himself remarks, made uncommon haste, but was yet detained through various hindrances (Mansi, t. iv. p. 1397; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1555), his arrival in Ephesus may have taken place at the beginning of August.

² In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1367 sqq.

respecting his proceedings at Ephesus: "Immediately after his arrival in Ephesus he had greeted the bishops, as many as he met of both sides, and had announced to them, as well as to those who were absent (Cyril and Memnon in particular had not appeared), that they should assemble all together the next day in his residence. At the same time he had decided in what order they should enter, so that conflicts should not arise at the meeting together of the two parties. Very early, almost at daybreak, Nestorius and John of Antioch had come, somewhat later Cyril and the other bishops; only Memnon had failed. The adherents of Cyril, however, had immediately demanded the removal of Nestorius, because he was already deposed, and therefore the sacred letter (of the Emperor) ought not to be read in his presence and in that of the Orientals (Antiochenes). On the other hand, the Antiochenes had demanded the same in reference to Cyril and Memnon, who had also been deposed by them, and a long and violent dispute had arisen on this question. After a considerable portion of the day had been spent in this manner, he (the Count) had succeeded, by persuasion and *force*, as he must plainly declare, and in spite of the opposition of Cyril's party, in having the imperial letter read without the presence of Cyril and Nestorius, to whom, in fact, it was not addressed. Thus the deposition of Cyril, Nestorius, and Memnon had been proclaimed, and the Antiochenes had received this with approval, and confirmed it; while the others declared the deposition of Cyril and Memnon to be illegal. In order to avoid greater excitement, Count Candidian had undertaken the custody of (the now imprisoned) Nestorius, and he had given Cyril into the hands of Count Jacobus, and had sent officers, together with the senior deacon of Ephesus, to the absent Memnon, in order to announce to him his deposition. Thereupon he (John) had proceeded to the church for prayer, and when he learned that Memnon was still at the episcopal residence, had immediately summoned him to come to him. To the question why he had not come in the morning, Memnon had made an insufficient excuse, that he had then immediately of his own accord gone to the Count's lodging, had been there arrested, and given over also into the custody of

Jacobus. Finally, he (John) had taken pains to exhort the bishops to peace and unity, and would do so still further, and would afterwards acquaint the Emperors with everything of importance that should take place.”¹

That Cyril and Memnon were separated and kept apart in a strong prison, and watched by many soldiers, we know from two letters of the Antiochenes, who announced this triumphantly to their adherents.² The orthodox Synod, however, appealed in a frank letter to the Emperors (of the East and West), declaring that the decree published by Count John had caused deep disturbance, and proved that some treachery and falsehood had perverted the ears of the Emperors, who had formerly been so truth-loving. The matter was represented in the imperial edict as though the Synod itself had pronounced a sentence of deposition on Cyril and Memnon; but it was not the Œcumenical Synod, which was in union with the Roman and apostolic see, with the whole of the West, with the whole of Africa and Illyricum, that had done this; on the contrary, it admired those two bishops on account of their zeal for the orthodox faith, and believed that they were, before men and before Christ the Lord, worthy of noble garlands. It was only Nestorius, as the herald of the new heresy of the man-worshippers, that they had deposed, and of this they had given the Emperors information. It had further pained them greatly—and this, too, could be explained only on the ground of deception—that the names of John of Antioch and his adherents, also those of the Cœlestians (Pelagians), although condemned by the Œcumenical Synod, were included among the bishops of the Synod, and that the imperial *Sacra* were addressed to them as to the bishops of the Synod. Then a brief account was given of the conduct of the Antiochenes, with which we are already acquainted, and the history of their separation from the Synod, with the remark that they could not possibly be received into church communion, partly because they had not subscribed the deposition of Nestorius and quite openly

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1397 sq., and with a somewhat different text in t. v. p. 779; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1555.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 784 and 786; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1559 and 1560.

agreed with him, partly because, through their insolence towards the presidents of the Synod (that is, through their sentence against Cyril and Memnon), they had violated the canons; partly, in fine, because they had dared to lie to and deceive the Emperors. The Synod prayed therefore that the Emperors would restore Cyril and Memnon, and provide for the stedfast maintenance of the faith, which was inherited from their fathers, which was impressed on the hearts of the Emperors by the Holy Spirit, and which was contained in the declarations of the Synod issued against Nestorius. If, however, the Emperors wished to learn more exactly what had taken place between the Synod and the Antiochenes, they might send trustworthy commissioners.¹ The meaning here attached to the last sentence is given by the Greek text as it exists; in accordance, however, with a conjecture of Tillemont, which is very worthy of notice, it would read: "If the Emperors wished to know that more exactly, they should order the Synod to send trustworthy envoys (to Constantinople)" (τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ ἐπιτρέπειν ἐκπέμψαι κ.τ.λ.); and this conjecture is supported by the consideration that—(a) not the sending of new imperial commissioners to Ephesus, but only the sending of envoys from the Synod to Constantinople could be of use, and therefore could be desired by the Synod; (b) that the Emperor did, in fact, somewhat later sanction the sending of envoys from the Synod; and (c) that the Synod, in their subsequent letter (see below, § 146), expressly assert that the Emperors had granted their requests, and permitted the sending of deputies.²

With reference to this suggestion of the Synod to the Emperors, Cyril addressed from his prison a letter to the clergy and the people of Constantinople, in which he asserts that Count John (really the imperial decree) had not properly represented the state of the case,³ and had falsely ascribed the deposition of Cyril and Memnon to the Synod. For this reason they were

¹ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1434; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1591.

² Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. xiv. note 60, *Sur St. Cyrille*.

³ Walch thinks (*Ketzergesch.* v. 518) that John was accused of having sent false reports from Ephesus to the Emperor. But this is not suggested here. Cyril has here rather in view the imperial *Sacra* brought by John, and writes (politely) on account of John, what he has to find fault with in it.

under the necessity of sending a new account to the Emperor. The imperial commissioner had taken all trouble to bring about the union of the Synod with John of Antioch and his adherents, but this was not possible until the Antiochenes should have recalled their illegal resolutions, approached the Synod as petitioners, and anathematized in writing the doctrines of Nestorius. In order, however, to reach his end by another way, the Count had demanded a written confession of faith from the Synod with the view of having it subscribed by the Antiochenes, and of then declaring, "I have reunited those who were separated." The Synod, however, had not agreed to this, but had remarked that they were there, not to give an account respecting their faith, but to confirm the wavering faith, and that the Emperor did not need now, for the first time, to be taught their faith, for it was known to him since his baptism.

Cyril further relates that the Antiochenes were not agreed among themselves as to whether Mary should be called "Mother of God" or not, since some of them would rather have their hands cut off than subscribe this expression. Of all this he informed the Constantinopolitans, particularly the archimandrites, so that Count John, when he returned, should not carry false information and mislead the people. The Constantinopolitans, too, should continue their efforts on behalf of the Synod, for there were at Ephesus bishops who were not even personally known to him, ready to go with him into exile, and even to death. He was himself watched by soldiers, who slept before his door, and the whole Synod was in a very exhausted condition; several members were dead, and the others so impoverished that they had been forced to sell their possessions in order to procure the means of subsistence.¹

Another letter was addressed by the Ephesine Synod to the bishops and clergy present in Constantinople,² in which they say that Ephesus is like a prison, in which they have

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1435; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1593. The letter of Memnon to the clergy of Constantinople (Mansi, *l.c.* p. 1438; and Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 1595) is earlier, and was composed before the arrival of Count John.

² The bishops referred to are not mentioned by name here, as they are later (see p. 90 f.), perhaps because their names were not yet known at Ephesus.

been shut up for three months (the letter must therefore have been written at the end of August or the beginning of September), so that they have not been able to send a messenger by land or by water to the court or elsewhere; and as often as they have ventured upon it, the bearers have exposed themselves to countless dangers of life, and have been forced to conceal themselves in all kinds of disguises. The reason of this strict watching arose from the false accounts which had been sent from all sides to the Emperors. By one class they (the bishops of the Synod) had been denounced as the cause of the division, by others it had been said that the Synod itself had deposed Cyril and Memnon; and again, others had perhaps asserted that the Synod was ready to come to a friendly union with the schismatical false Synod of the Antiochenes. It was in order to prevent the exposure of these falsehoods that the Synod was so closely watched, and that war was so violently carried on against it. The clergy of Constantinople should therefore cast themselves at the feet of the Emperor and acquaint him with all. The further contents of the letter give the substance of that which the Constantinopolitans are to communicate to the Emperor: that the Synod had by no means deposed Cyril and Memnon, but held both in the highest honour, and would never separate from communion with them; that, on the other hand, they never could hold communion with the schismatic Conciliabulum, for the same reasons which the Synod had already (p. 86) assigned in their letter to the Emperor, but which they now repeated, because, in their state of blockade, they were forced to doubt whether that letter had reached the Emperor. In conclusion, the clergy of Constantinople are once more exhorted to beseech the Emperor, in the name of the whole Synod, to restore Cyril and Memnon, to liberate the bishops of the Synod from their imprisonment, and to give them leave either to return home or to appear in his own presence, so that they might not all perish, partly through sickness, and partly through sorrow.

In order to make the letter more concise, all the bishops of the Synod did not subscribe, but only their heads,—whether Cyril and Memnon, or Juvenal and another metropolitan, is doubtful. In an appendix it is added: "We are slaughtered

here by the heat; almost daily one is buried; all our servants are worn out, and have to be sent home. Go therefore to the Emperor and represent to him the distress of the Synod. Finally, be assured that, however our death may be disregarded, on the part of Christ nothing else will take place than that which we have decided."¹

This letter, it would appear, crossed the one which the bishops who were present at Constantinople sent on the 13th of August to the Synod. They expressed in it their liveliest sympathy with their distress, and assured them that they felt bound personally to appear at Ephesus, but that the way by sea and land was closed against them. They had, however, worked for the Synod in Constantinople, inflamed the zeal of many, and strengthened men's minds in their adhesion to it. The Synod would therefore, they requested, let them know what they had to do, and whether they should come to Ephesus in order to share their conflict and their sufferings.²

We learn the names of these bishops from the superscription of the answer which the Synod sent to them.³ They were Eulalius, Eutrechius, Acacius, Chrysaphius, Jeremias, Theodule, and Isaïas. The Synod now tell them how greatly they rejoice at this sympathy, inform them anew of the progress of events and of their own condition, and request the bishops to remain at Constantinople, on the one hand, in order to acquaint the Emperor with the condition of the Synod; and, on the other, to give them information as to what is passing at Constantinople. As, however, it was feared that the previous letters had not been made known to the bishops, a copy of them was now added, and, at the same time, a second account addressed to the Emperor.⁴ The bishops might now, in case

¹ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1443 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1599 sqq.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1450; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1603.

³ We assume that this letter of the Synod to the bishops was the second which they sent to them, and so later than that mentioned p. 89, although the reverse is possible.

⁴ I think the words of the text must be understood to mean that it was at this time that the second account was addressed to the Emperor, and that it was sent on this occasion. Accordingly I assign a different chronological position to this second account from that which is commonly given, *e.g.* by Walch, *Ketzergesch.* Bd. v. S. 519.

the Emperors had received the previous account, put them in mind of it; if not, then the Emperors should learn from the bishops what had been kept from them by intrigue.¹

In this second letter the Synod urgently entreated that they might at last be delivered from their distress, and that their heads, Cyril and Memnon, should be given back to them; and they strengthen this appeal by a short but detailed and calm narration of the way and manner in which the Antiochenes had separated from the rest of the bishops, and how those of Nestorian opinions had connected themselves with John of Antioch. At the same time, it was towards the end quite correctly remarked: If the Emperors confirmed, as they had done, the deposition of Nestorius, it would certainly be quite inconsistent if they gave their assent to that which the friends of Nestorius had done, in order to avenge him. This letter was signed by Juvenal of Jerusalem, who since the imprisonment of Cyril had been president of the Synod.²

The last document which at this time went forth from the orthodox side at Ephesus is a short letter of Cyril's to the three bishops, Theopemptus, Potamon, and Daniel, whom the Synod had at an earlier period sent to Constantinople (see p. 79). In this he said that several false accusations had been raised against him, as, that he had brought with him both attendants and women from monasteries, and that Nestorius had been deposed only by his intrigues, and not by the will of the Synod. But, God be praised, Count John had recognised the falsehood of these charges, and had condemned his accusers. Moreover, in consequence of the imperial *Sacra*, he was still under arrest, and did not see what it would lead to; but he must thank God that he was thought worthy to be put in chains for His name's sake. The Synod, on their side, had in no way allowed themselves to be misled into having communion with the Antiochenes, and had declared that they would never do so until these withdrew their insolent resolutions against the

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1450 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1606.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1441; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1597.

heads of the Synod, and confessed the true faith, for they were still Nestorian, and this was the turning-point of the whole controversy.¹

In the meantime, the clergy of Constantinople had delivered to the Emperor Theodosius the Younger a memorial on behalf of the Ephesine Synod, addressed to him and to his colleague in the empire, which at the very beginning sets forth the proposition that God should be obeyed rather than the rulers, and that therefore a frank word had become a matter of duty. The deposition of Cyril and Memnon by the Antiochenes is next declared to be entirely illegal, and the Emperors are entreated to restore those two highly meritorious bishops, and to confirm those decrees which the far larger number at Ephesus (in opposition to the Antiochenes) had drawn up. If Cyril, the leader (*καθηγητής*) of the Synod, had anything to endure contrary to what was right, this affected the whole Synod which agreed with him, and as a matter of consistency all the bishops ought to have been punished in the same way as Cyril and Memnon. But the God-loving Emperors should take thought that the Church, which they cherished like a nurse, should not be rent, and that the century of the martyrs should not be renewed.²

To this time probably belongs also the short letter of Dalmatius to the Synod, mentioned above (p. 79, note 3), in which he announces the reception of the letters sent to him, expresses his sympathy with reference to the death of several members of the Synod, and assures them that he has now, as hitherto, fulfilled the wishes of the Synod.³ Another letter was addressed to Cyril by Alypius, a priest of the Apostles' Church in Constantinople, in which he congratulates him on his sufferings, and compares him with Athanasius.⁴ Cyril himself, however, employed the leisure which his imprisonment afforded in drawing up a clearer explanation

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1447; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1601.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1453; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1607.

³ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1258; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1446. It is certainly erroneous to suppose that Dalmatius had not sooner sided with the Synod; and that now he went for the first time with his monks in front of the imperial palace. He speaks himself, in the letter mentioned above, of *earlier* services.

⁴ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1463; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1614.

of his twelve anathematisms which had been so often assailed.¹

SEC. 145. *The Creed of the Antiochenes. Their subsequent Letters.*

On the other hand, the Antiochenes also were taking all possible pains to win the Emperor to their side. More especially they despatched to him by Count John a paper, which is extant only in Latin, partaking chiefly of the character of a polite letter, which exalts the recently issued imperial edict (on account of the deposition of Cyril, etc.) above all measure, as calculated again to pacify the whole world, which the Egyptian (Cyril) had, according to his custom, thrown into confusion. After the arrival of this edict, they had immediately hastened to condemn the anti-evangelical and anti-apostolic propositions of Cyril (his anathematisms), in which he ventured to pronounce anathema on the saints of all the past, and for which he had, only through abuse of the ignorance of some and the sickness of others, as well as by his own craft and obstinacy, gained surreptitiously a synodal confirmation. As the holy Father Acacius (of Beroëa) had written to the Synod, these were Apollinarian propositions, and this bishop of one hundred and ten years old, who knew the Apollinarians so thoroughly, must certainly know this. They had, therefore, in union with Count John, entreated the bishops who had been misled by Cyril, and who had subscribed those propositions, now to declare the same erroneous, and in common with them (the Antiochenes) to subscribe the Nicene formula. These, however, had refused, and therefore it only remained for them, simply on their own behalf, to confess the true faith, and to reject those false propositions by a written manifesto. The Creed of Nicæa needed no addition; since, however, the Emperors, as Count John had intimated, required a declaration in regard to the holy Virgin and God-bearer, they would, although such things transcended human powers, under invocation of divine aid, and to confute their enemies, give expression to their belief: "We acknowledge that our Lord Jesus Christ, the

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 1 sqq., and Cyrilli *Opp.* ed. Aubert, t. vi. p. 145 sqq.

only-begotten Son of God, is true God, and true man, consisting of a reasonable soul and a body; that He was born (begotten) before all time by the Father, as to His Godhead, and was in the end of the days, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin as to His manhood, of one substance with the Father in respect to His Godhead, and of one substance with us in respect to His manhood. For two natures are united together (*unio facta est*), and therefore we acknowledge one Christ, one Lord, and one Son. On account of this union, which is, however, far from being a mingling (*inconfusa unio*), we also confess that the holy Virgin is the *God-bearer*, because God the Word was made flesh, and by the incarnation, from the time of His conception, has united the temple (manhood) which He assumed of her (the Virgin) with Himself."¹ They add the request that the Emperor will, in his wonted manner, take under his protection the religion which has been endangered by the Egyptian propositions, and demand of all the bishops the rejection of Cyril's propositions, and the subscription of the unaltered Nicene Creed; for without the rejection of those propositions, no peace is possible in the Church.²

In proportion as this letter did wrong to Cyril, and found Apollinarianism where none existed, so did it on the other side weaken the reproach of Cyril and his friends, that the Antiochenes were quite Nestorian in their opinions; for the formula drawn up by them bears a thoroughly orthodox sense, and was subsequently approved even by Cyril. The Antiochenes, however, conceal in this letter the fact, that by no means the whole of the members of their party had agreed to this form of faith, as we learn from a letter of Bishop Alexander of Hierapolis, who expresses himself as decidedly for Nestorius, and against *θεοτόκος* and that formula of the Antiochenes, and accuses the latter of falsehood and wickedness, who, although the Emperor required no such declaration, had thereby betrayed the orthodox Nestorius.³ We see,

¹ Cf. below, sec. 155, where the same creed appears again, and where the Greek text is also given.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 781 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1557.

³ In Mansi, t. v. p. 874.

therefore, that Cyril could justly accuse at least some of the Antiochenes of Nestorianism; and that his assertion, quoted above (p. 88), that the controversy respecting the *θεοτόκος* had arisen among the Antiochenes themselves, was entirely in accordance with truth.

In the letter to the Emperors just mentioned, the Antiochenes refer to a document which they had put forth after the arrival of Count John, in which they, on the one hand, had renewed the Nicene Creed, and, on the other, had rejected the twelve propositions of Cyril by a written declaration. This paper, I believe, we possess in a document which has been erroneously attributed to a somewhat earlier period, but which decidedly cannot have been drawn up before the arrival of Count John, since it speaks of *three* edicts which the Emperors had addressed to the Synod. This is the synodal declaration mentioned above (p. 80, note 3), subscribed by John of Antioch and all his adherents, with the heading *De Schismaticis*.¹

A third letter was now addressed by the Antiochene Conciliabulum at Ephesus to the clergy, the monks, and the people of Antioch, in which they relate, not without a good deal of self-praise, all that has hitherto been done, and then remark that Cyril and Memnon, even in their close imprisonment, have not yet come to a better mind, and continue to throw all into confusion, apparently from despair. They had not troubled themselves, they say, about the excommunication pronounced, and had continued their spiritual functions. In accordance, therefore, with the ecclesiastical regulation (canon 4 of the Synod of Antioch of 341), they could no longer be restored, and knowing this well, they endeavoured to make the confusion in the Church lasting. In Antioch, however, they might have good hope, and thank God for what had been done, pray for the erring, deliver sermons against the impious doctrine (of Cyril), and deliver up to the judges every one who sought in any way to propagate it.²

At the same time the false Synod appealed to the aged Bishop Acacius of Beroea, assured him of its zeal against

¹ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1375; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1535.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 784; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1559.

Apollinarianism, and announced that even now those who had been misled by Cyril would not obey the imperial command, or reject those false propositions. They (the Antiochenes) had with much trouble drawn up complete refutations of these propositions, and invited their opponents to a disputation on them; but they had not appeared, but continued to confuse everything, and were sending into all cities and provinces lying letters full of accusations against the Antiochenes. But they could thus mislead none but the simple; every one else knew that what proceeds from deposed men has no power at all. These, however, were for ever deposed, since even after their excommunication they had discharged spiritual functions. Cyril and Memnon were very carefully imprisoned, and watched by soldiers day and night. Acacius might thank God, and pray for the Antiochenes, and for those who had erred, that the latter might return to the ancient faith.¹

SEC. 146. *The Emperor summons before him Deputies from both sides.*

The efforts of Dalmatius and of the bishops who were present at Constantinople were not without favourable results, and the latter remarked in their letter to the Synod of Ephesus, mentioned above (p. 90), that it was rumoured that the Emperor had already gained a truer view of the subject.² How this change was gradually brought about is unknown; we know only that Theodosius now resolved to comply with the petition of the Synod, and personally to hear deputies from both sides. Baronius thinks that the overthrow of his general, Aspar, in his war with the Vandals in Africa, shook the Emperor, and changed him; but Tillemont remarks against this, with justice, that, on the one side, Theodosius had taken the previous false steps only from ignorance, and not from any evil will, and thus could not well

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 785; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1560.

² This is the meaning of the Greek text: *χρηστὰ τὰ παρὰ τοῦ θεοφιλοτάτου βασιλέως ἡμῖν ἀγγίλλεται*, where *ἡμῖν* is to be connected with *ἀγγίλλεται* (it is told us). The Latin translation has altered the sense: *Imperator meliora de nobis cogitare dicitur*. Mansi, t. iv. p. 1450; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1603.

have regarded a misfortune as a punishment from God; and that, on the other side, that unfortunate battle did not take place before the end of August 431, and therefore the result could not have been known so early in Constantinople.¹

The decree by which the Emperor summoned before him eight representatives of each of the two parties is no longer extant, and we are acquainted with it only from its results, and from the writings to which it gave occasion on both sides. Count John made it known to the one side as well as to the other, and each party made haste to elect and send its commissioners. On the Catholic side the Roman priest and papal legate Philip, and the Bishop Arcadius (also a papal legate), Juvenal (of Jerusalem), Flavian (of Philippi), Firmus (of Cæsarea in Cappadocia), Theodotus (of Ancyra), Acacius (of Melitene), and Euoptyus (of Ptolemais, in Africa) were selected.² Cyril, too, would gladly have been among the number of these deputies, but he was obliged, as was Memnon also, to remain in prison. From the Antiochene side, John of Antioch, John of Damascus, Himerius of Nicomedia, Paulus of Emisa, Macarius of Laodicea, Apringius of Chalcis, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Helladius of Ptolemais (in Phœnicia) were entrusted with the office of deputies.³

The mandate which the orthodox Synod committed to their deputies, given in a somewhat free translation, is as follows: "Since the God-loving Emperors have given us permission, in the name of the whole world, which, represented by the Synod, contends for the right faith, to send an embassy to Constantinople in the interest of orthodoxy and of the holy Bishops Cyril and Memnon, we have selected you for this

¹ Baron. *ad ann.* 431, n. 137 sqq.; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. xiv. note 61, *Sur St. Cyrille*.

² It is remarkable that in the synodal documents relating to this subject (in Mansi, t. iv. p. 1458; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1610) the Roman priest Philip is named *primo loco*, before the other papal legate Arcadius, although he was a bishop, and before Juvenal, etc. Peter de Marca (*De concordia*, etc., lib. v. c. 4, § 8) would explain this as merely an error of the transcriber; but Tillemont long ago saw (*Mém.* t. xiv. p. 471) the weakness of this argument, without, however, supplanting it by another. It may suffice to remember that on several former occasions, as we saw above (p. 64), Philip stood *primo loco* among the papal legates. In the next document, however, he appears again *ultimo loco*.

³ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1399; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1562.

purpose, and give you the following instructions. Before all, you must consent to no communion with John of Antioch and his apostate Council, because they have refused in common with us to depose Nestorius, because they have been his patrons up to the time of your departure, because they have ventured, in opposition to all the canons, to condemn Cyril and Memnon; but especially because to this day they defend the doctrines of Nestorius, and besides, many of them are Cœlestians (Pelagians), and for this reason are deposed; finally, because they have not shrunk from slandering the Synod of the whole world as heretical. If, however, the Emperor urgently requires it (for we must always obey him, when possible), you shall grant the Antiochenes communion on the condition that they subscribe the deposition of Nestorius, ask the forgiveness of the Synod in writing, with reference to Cyril and Memnon, principally, anathematize the heresies of Nestorius, reject his adherents, and take common action with the Synod for the restitution of Cyril and Memnon. Moreover, you must communicate on every point with the Synod, since the complete restoration of peace with the Antiochenes needs their approval; and you must not allow communion to the Antiochenes until the Synod have received back their heads (Cyril and Memnon)." This document is signed by Bishop Berinianus of Perge, who now probably, as the oldest of the metropolitans (as Juvenal was among the deputies), occupied the presidency of the Council.¹

The Synod entrusted their delegates with the following letter to the Emperors. They said "they had at last responded to the prayers of the Synod, and had allowed the command to be conveyed to them by Count John, that they should send a deputation. The Synod thanked them for this, and sent Arcadius, etc. (the Roman priest Philip is here named *ultimo loco*) as their representatives, and prayed the Emperors, on their behalf, for a benevolent reception and a favourable hearing. At the same time they would mention in this letter that which weighed so heavily on them. They then relate how Nestorius was summoned sixteen days after the expiry of the appointed period, and had not appeared; how John of Antioch and his

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1457 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1609 sqq.

adherents had comported themselves, had deposed Cyril and Memnon, and had also deceived the Emperor by false intelligence, and what had then been done on the part of the Synod. They now, by their letter and their deputies, embraced the knees of the Emperors, and prayed that they would annul the sentence obtained by deception against Cyril and Memnon, and give back to the assembly their heads. For these were altogether sound in faith, and the whole Synod shared their faith, as they had declared in writing. In these their heads the whole bishops regarded themselves as prisoners, and the Emperors were therefore requested to release them all from bonds.”¹

The Antiochenes, too, did not fail to commit to their deputies, whom we have already mentioned, a written mandate, which, however, only indulges in general expressions on the rights and duties of those elected, and stipulates for the ratification of all the proceedings of the Conciliabulum. This would, however, satisfy everything, if only the heretical propositions of Cyril were rejected. All the Antiochenes, with Alexander of Hierapolis and Dorotheus of Marcianopolis at their head, signed this commission.²

SEC. 147. *The Deputies of both Parties are summoned to Chalcedon.*

From a short letter of the Antiochene deputies to their Conciliabulum, dated the 11th Gorpiaëus, that is, the 11th of September 431,³ we learn that the Emperor Theodosius had in the meantime altered his plan, and did not allow either of the parties to enter Constantinople, but ordered them to go to Chalcedon (*vis-à-vis* to Constantinople, and separated from it only by the Bosphorus), and to await him there. Disturbances among the monks, according to the Antiochenes, induced him to take this decision. At the same time we learn from this letter that Nestorius, about eight days before, had received

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1462, t. v. p. 651 ; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1611.

² In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1399, t. v. p. 791 ; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1562.

³ The Syrian month Gorpiaëus is exactly the same as the Roman month September. Cf. Ideler, *Lehrbuch der Chronol.* 1831, S. 180 f. Petavius maintained the same. Usher, on the contrary, and others, think that Gorpiaëus began with the 25th of August, and that the 11th Gorp. is therefore = September 4. Cf. Tillemont, *l.c.* note 63, *Sur St. Cyrille*.

notice to quit Ephesus, and to return to the monastery in which he was formerly a monk. The deputies of the Antiochenes complained of this, because it must have appeared like a confirmation of the unjust judgment pronounced against Nestorius. They then declare their readiness to contend for the faith even to blood, and remark that on that day, the 11th of the month Gorpiaëus, they expect the Emperor, who is on his way to Rufinianum, a suburb of Chalcedon. Finally, they commend themselves to the prayers of their friends, to whom they wish steadfastness in the faith, and conclude with the intelligence that Himerius (Bishop of Nicomedia, one of the Antiochene deputies, who had been taken ill on the way) had not yet arrived.¹

We have just heard that Nestorius had received notice, during the interval between the departure of the deputies of the two parties and their arrival in Chalcedon, to leave Ephesus. The edict in which this was announced to him we still possess, if not quite in its entirety, and it probably proceeded from the prefect of the Prætorians, Antiochus, but according to the ordinary custom it was drawn up in the name of *all* the prefects. It is short and courteous, but definite, and states that, as Nestorius himself had wished² to depart from Ephesus and to return into his previous monastery, a convoy had been provided for him, which would attend upon him during his journey. He was allowed himself to choose the route, whether by land or by water, but these attendants had to accompany him to his monastery (that of S. Euprepious at Antioch). In conclusion, all good is wished him for his future life; and it is added that he, with his wisdom, cannot lack for comfort.³

Nestorius answered:⁴ "He had received the letter of the prefect, and from that had learnt the command of the Emperor that he should henceforth live in the monastery. He

¹ Hardouin, t. i. p. 1568; Mansi, t. iv. p. 1406; still better, t. v. p. 794, with the notes of Baluzius *ibid.*

² He had asked for this permission when the Emperor summoned the deputies and he now regarded his cause as lost. Evagrius, i. 7.

³ Mansi, t. v. p. 792; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1631.

⁴ *Epistola Nestorii ad eundem Præfectum prætorium Antiochenum* (probably *Antiochium*), in Mansi, t. v. p. 793; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1631.

accepted this thankfully, for nothing was more honourable in his view than to be exiled for the sake of religion. He only requested that the prefect would use his endeavours with the Emperor, that imperial edicts might be published in all churches in order to the rejection of the false doctrines of Cyril, so as to prevent an offence to the simple."

If we turn our attention again to the deputies of the two parties and their efforts, we must chiefly lament the great dearth of original sources of information, especially that there is not a single original document from the orthodox deputies, and from this whole side generally only a single contemporaneous brief account of what was done (see p. 108, note 1, and p. 110) has come down to us. But even the documents which proceed from the Antiochenes and the Emperor are too defective to enable us to understand in sufficient detail the proceedings at Chalcedon. We believe we may venture to place the little that is known in the following chronological order. In the first place stands the short account just mentioned of the Antiochene deputies to those whom they represented, in which they announce the arrival of the Emperor on the 11th of Gorpiaëus (September 11) 431. A few days afterwards they despatched again a short letter to their friends at Ephesus, in which they gave them an account of the first proceedings which took place at Chalcedon in the presence of the Emperor. They are full of joy, for the Emperor has received their proposals very favourably, and they have triumphed over their opponents. That which these had brought forward had made a bad impression. Ever and anon these had put forward the name of their Cyril, and had entreated that he might himself be allowed to appear and undertake his own cause. They had not, however, attained to this, but it had been insisted upon that the faith should be considered and the doctrine of the holy Fathers affirmed. Further, they (the Antiochenes) had opposed Acacius of Melitene, a friend of Cyril's, because he maintained that the Godhead was capable of suffering (cf. p. 122). At this blasphemy the Emperor had been so much annoyed that he shook his purple mantle. The whole Senate, too, agreed with him. At last the Emperor had commanded that each side should hand in to him a written

account of their faith. They had replied that they could give no other declaration of faith than the Nicene, and this also had greatly pleased the Emperor. All Constantinople had come out to them, and entreated them to contend bravely for the faith. In conclusion, they adjoined two copies of the Nicene declaration of faith, designed for the Emperor, so that the Conciliabulum might sign them with their own hands.¹

The Antiochenes at Ephesus were highly delighted at this, and immediately sent the two documents back with their signatures, assuring their deputies in their answer that they would rather die than accept one of the heretical propositions of Cyril. But if these propositions were heretical, so also were the sentences of deposition which the adherents of these propositions had pronounced (they referred particularly to those against Nestorius, as is clear from the letter which follows), and entirely null and void. They confided in the envoys that they would obtain from the Emperor the rejection both of the chapters (of the anathematisms) of Cyril and of those sentences of deposition, and they transmitted to them a copy of the explanation of his anathematisms, recently drawn up by Cyril, so that they might the more easily demonstrate his impicity.²

This document was signed by forty-two adherents of the Antiochene party, Tranquillinus of Antioch, in Pisidia, at their head;³ at the same time they transmitted a letter to the Emperor, in which they thank him for the friendly reception of their deputies, glory in the zeal of the Emperor for the faith, and make intercession for Nestorius, without directly naming him, as his deposition by the heretical party of Cyril was invalid.⁴ At an earlier period, when the Emperor pronounced a sentence of deposition on Nestorius at the same time as upon Cyril and Memnon, they had preserved a cowardly

¹ We no longer possess the original Greek text of this letter, but two Latin translations, in no considerable degree divergent from each other, in Mansi, t. iv. p. 1411, and t. v. p. 795. The former is also in Hardouin, t. i. p. 1572.

² In Hardouin, t. i. p. 1577, and Mansi, t. iv. p. 1417; and in the *Synodicon*, *ibid.* t. v. p. 795-797.

³ These signatures are given in only one of the two translations in Mansi, t. v. p. 797, and Hardouin, t. i. p. 1578.

⁴ In Hardouin, t. i. p. 1579, and Mansi, t. iv. p. 1419; and in the *Synodicon*, *ibid.* t. v. p. 797.

silence, and had even commended the imperial wisdom, and separated themselves entirely from Nestorius, as even one of their own friends, Alexander of Hierapolis, reproached them with having done (p. 94). Now, on the contrary, the moment seemed to have come to throw off the mask, and again to take the side of Nestorius. They deceived themselves, however, and their sanguine hopes did not in the least progress towards fulfilment.

There were, in fact, at Chalcedon, after the first session just mentioned, four other sessions, or series of proceedings, held in the presence of the Emperor; but no record of the details has been preserved. At the most we have a few small fragments of Theodoret,¹ containing a polemic against the adherents of Cyril, belonging to the speeches which he may have delivered at these proceedings. The other existing documents are all drawn up *after* that session, and in particular a letter of the Antiochene deputies to Rufus, Archbishop of Thessalonica, who had in writing exhorted Julian, Bishop of Sardica, a member of the Conciliabulum,² to allow nothing to be added to the Nicene Creed, and nothing to be taken from it. The deputies commend him for this, speak again of the Apollinarianism of Cyril, of their own contending for the Nicene faith, of the deposition of Cyril and Memnon, of the impossibility of their restitution (because they had continued the exercise of their spiritual functions), and of the obstinacy of Cyril's party. The Emperor had already admonished the envoys of this party in five sessions, either to reject the chapters of Cyril, as contrary to the faith, or to prove their conformity with the doctrine of the holy Fathers in a disputation. They themselves (the Antiochenes) had collected complete proofs against these doctrines, together with evidences from Basil of Caesarea, Athanasius, Damasus of Rome, and Ambrose of Milan, and they gave some of them (but no patristic passages) for the benefit of Rufus, in order to prove that Cyril was an Arian

¹ In Schulze's edition of the works of Theodoret, t. v. p. 104 f.; and in Hardouin, t. iii. p. 136; and Mansi, t. ix. p. 292 sq. Among the Acts of the fifth Œcumenical Synod, Collat. v.

² Julian signed the letter to the deputies, mentioned at p. 101 f. (Mansi, t. v. p. 797; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1578); and also, at the beginning of the Ephesine Synod, the protest against their opening before the arrival of John of Antioch. See above, p. 45.

and a Eunomian. Of entirely similar views with their own were many Eastern and even Latin bishops. To this effect Bishop Martin of Milan had written to them, and sent them the work of S. Ambrose, *De Dominica Incarnatione*, which taught the opposite of those heretical chapters.¹ Besides, they said, Cyril and Memnon had not only falsified the faith, but had also violated all the canonical laws, and had received heretics, Pelagians and Euchites, into their communion, in order to multiply their number. They had thought that, by means of men and by the expenditure of much money, they could overthrow the faith of the Fathers. Rufus should beware of holding communion with them, and declare far and near that their chapters were Apollinarian. Finally, a copy of the letter sent by them to the Emperor lay before him, in which they had given utterance to the Nicene faith, and had opposed the chapters of Cyril.²

SEC. 148. *The Emperor decides in favour of the Orthodox, and summons their Deputies to Constantinople.*

The prospects of the Antiochenes had already become more troubled when Theodoret wrote from Chalcedon to Alexander of Hierapolis as follows: "No kind of friendliness, no kind of urgency, no kind of exhortation, no kind of eloquence had been by them left untried with the Emperor and his Senate in order that the Nicene Creed alone should be received, and the newly-introduced heresy should be rejected. But to the present day they had produced no effect, although they had even sworn to the Emperor that it was impossible for them to agree with Cyril and Memnon. As often as they had endeavoured to speak of Nestorius to the Emperor or the Senate, they were accused of departing from their previous resolutions, so great was the enmity against him, and the

¹ In opposition to this, cf. the remark of Baluzius in Mansi, t. v. p. 807, note a. He suggests that Bishop Martin of Milan could as yet have known nothing of a division in the Synod of Ephesus, but might have written to *the Synod generally*, and his letter, during the oppression of the orthodox, might have come into the hands of the Antiochenes. Apart from this, it is stated generally, even by Theodoret, that the Latins were on the anti-Nestorian side.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1411-1418; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1571.

Emperor had declared with decision that no one should venture again to speak to him of that man. Yet, as long as they were here, they would concern themselves about this father, Nestorius, convinced that wrong had been done him. In other respects they wished generally to be set free from this place, for there was no further hope of any success, as the judges (the imperial officials, who had to decide between the two parties) were accessible to gold, and maintained that the Godhead and manhood make only one nature. The people (of Constantinople), on the contrary, behaved admirably, and often came out to the Antiochene deputies. They had therefore begun to deliver discourses to them, and to have meetings for public worship with them in the great imperial Aula at Rufinianum. The clergy and the monks, however, were hostile to them, and once on their return from the meeting they had been stoned, and several had been wounded.¹ The Emperor had learnt it, and had said to Theodoret, when he met him: You assemble unlawfully; but Theodoret had frankly declared how unfair it was that the excommunicated (Cyril's party) should be allowed to hold their services in the churches, while all the churches were shut against them. (The people, clergy, and Bishop of Chalcedon were orthodox.) The Emperor, he said, should do as Count John did at Ephesus, and forbid divine service to both parties alike. The Emperor replied: I cannot give such an order to the Bishop of Chalcedon, but for the future I have not forbidden the meetings of the Antiochenes (without the Eucharist). The meetings were up to this time very much frequented; but they were themselves always in danger on account of the monks and clergy, and had, on the one side, to endure acts of violence, and on the other, (the Emperor's) indifference."²

It was not long before they experienced worse. Despairing of the possibility of a compromise, the Emperor suddenly

¹ The passage, "*et vulnerarentur multi ex laicis et falsis monachis, qui nobiscum erant*," according to the corresponding passage in the second memorial of the Antiochene deputies to the Emperor (see below, p. 108; and Mansi, t. iv. p. 1404; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1566), must be corrected to "*et vulnerarentur multi qui nobiscum erant, a laicis et falsis monachis*." In the second memorial it is "*A servis, monachorum habitu indutis*."

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1407, t. v. p. 799; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1568.

returned from Chalcedon to Constantinople, without the deputies of the Antiochenes venturing to follow him, whilst he ordered those of the orthodox party to come after him, and to ordain another Bishop of Constantinople in the place of the deposed Nestorius.¹ The Antiochenes, who had expected further sessions, were greatly troubled at this, but would not yet give up the hope of triumphing over their opponents in discussions, and therefore directly sent after the Emperor a memorial,² of which we no longer possess the Greek original, but of which we have two ancient Latin translations, diverging considerably from each other, and in many places evidently corrupt. On the whole, that text which is given by the *Synodicon* of Irenæus³ is less corrupt than the other,⁴ so that for the most part we adhere to the former.

The document begins with a violent attack upon Cyril and his adherents, accuses him even of heresy, and ascribes to him (as Nestorius had done before) the intention of giving occasion for the whole confusion, and the misleading of the others by all kinds of promises, in order to escape punishment for his own offences (see above, pp. 27 and 56). To this the assurance was added how willingly the Antiochenes would be silent, but how their conscience, because it was a question of the overthrow of the faith, imperatively required of them that they should come and make their petition to the Emperor, who, next to God, was the protector of the world. They adjure him then, by God, who sees all, by Christ, who will judge all, by the Holy Ghost, through whose grace he governs, and by the angels who protect him, to avenge the religion which is now attacked, to order the abolition of the heretical chapters of Cyril, and to give instructions that every one who has subscribed them, and who, in spite of the pardon offered by the Antiochenes, perseveres in his contentiousness, shall come here (to a new disputation on the theological controversy in the presence of the Emperor), and be punished, after the sentence of the

¹ See below, pp. 108, 110, and 116.

² That it was sent to the Emperor after his departure from Constantinople is declared by the superscription, in Hardouin, t. i. p. 1563; and Mansi, t. v. p. 802. Cf. *ibid.* t. iv. p. 1401, note 1.

³ In Mansi, t. v. p. 802 sqq.

⁴ In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1401; and Hardouin, t. i. p. 1563.

Emperor, in accordance with the ecclesiastical laws. The Emperor could do nothing better to express his thankfulness that Christ had granted him so many victories over the Persians and other barbarians. Moreover, it was necessary that the proceedings (the disputations of the deputies on both sides) should be produced in writing in presence of the Emperor. He could then decide whether those who suppressed the true faith, and yet would not stand to their new doctrines nor discuss them, were henceforth worthy to be called teachers. They had conspired among themselves, and intended to grant ecclesiastical privileges as the wages of impiety (to their adherents), and in various ways to destroy canonical order, if the Emperor did not prevent it.¹ Nay, the Emperor would see how, when they had overthrown the faith of Christ, they would soon distribute the spoils of victory as the wages of treachery. In many ways Juvenal of Jerusalem had been guilty of presumption (they had previously, however, been silent on the subject), and his plans on both Phœnicia and Arabia were well known to them. In opposing these efforts they put their hope in the judgment of God and in the piety of the Emperor; at the present moment, however, they, before everything and exclusively, presented a petition on behalf of the purity of the faith, that this which has had such glory since Constantine, and even under the present Emperor has been extended to Persia, should not be oppressed in the very palace of the Emperor himself. If any one should ever venture to become indifferent in regard to religion, they hoped that might be any one rather than the Emperor, to whom God had entrusted the power over the whole world. They were ready to follow his decision, for God would enlighten him so that he might perfectly apprehend the subject to be handled (in the proposed disputation). Should, however, such a new disputation be impossible, then let the Emperor allow them to return home to their dioceses.

¹ As is shown by what follows, this refers chiefly to Jerusalem. The Antiochenes accused the party of Cyril of having promised Juvenal of Jerusalem, in reward for his assistance, their support in his endeavour to obtain a higher hierarchical position. In fact, however, as we saw above, p. 77, Cyril did the reverse.

A short time afterwards they addressed a second memorial to the Emperor, and there give an account, from their own point of view, of the whole course of the Synod of Ephesus, and the summoning of the deputies to Chalcedon. They say further, that the opposite party had entered into no conferences with them on the subject of Cyril's propositions, and to this party, although persisting in heresy, permission had been given at Chalcedon to attend church and to hold divine service, while they (the Antiochenes), for a long time at Ephesus, and here also, had been forced to be without holy communion. They had endured much besides, and had even been pelted with stones by servants who were attired as monks. The Emperor had promised them one more session, but had departed for Constantinople, and had commanded the opposition party, although excommunicated, to follow him to celebrate divine service and even to ordain (a new bishop for Constantinople).¹ They, the Antiochene deputies, on the other hand, did not dare either to go to Constantinople or to return home. Of one mind with them were the bishops of Pontus, Asia, Thrace, Illyricum, and even of Italy, who would never approve of the teaching of Cyril, and had transmitted to the Emperor a writing of S. Ambrose which contradicted the new heresy (cf. p. 104). In conclusion, they pray that no bishop may be allowed to be ordained for Constantinople before a decision is arrived at as to the true faith.²

The Emperor answered by a short decree addressed to the whole Synod of Ephesus,—that is, to both parties in common,—in which he laments that the discord still lasts, and commands all the members of the Synod to return home from Ephesus, and again to fill their episcopal sees. Only Cyril and Memnon are to remain deposed.³

¹ The same thing is asserted in the only notice which we possess from the orthodox side, in Mansi, t. v. pp. 255 and 659; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1667.

² Mansi, t. iv. p. 1403, t. v. p. 805; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1565.

³ Mansi, t. v. p. 798. According to a letter of Acacius of Beroea, to be mentioned hereafter, the Emperor had confirmed the deposition of Cyril and Memnon anew, because it was shown that the eunuch Scholasticus had received presents from Cyril. See below, p. 112. Tillemont (*Mémoires* etc., t. xiv. p. 448) supposes that this new edict was speedily recalled, because the Antiochene deputies never boasted of it.

The Antiochene deputies now addressed their third memorial to the Emperor. "Such a result they had not expected, but their modesty had injured them. They had been so long detained at Chalcedon, and now they were sent home, while those who had thrown everything into confusion and divided the Church, exercised spiritual functions, celebrated divine service, held ordinations, and spent the property of the poor upon soldiers. And yet Theodosius was Emperor not for these only, but also for the Antiochenes, and the East was no small part of his kingdom. He should not despise the faith into which he had been baptized, for which so many martyrs had bled, through which he had overcome the barbarians, and of which he had now great need in the African war. God would protect him if he protected the faith, and did not allow the body of the Church to be rent. They further assure the Emperor that the party of Cyril repeat the errors of Apollinaris, Arius, and Eunomius, and discharge spiritual functions in a manner not permitted. The greatest part of the people, on the other hand, were still sound, and very anxious for the faith. If the Emperor, in spite of their adjuration, would not receive the true faith, then they shook the dust off their feet, crying, with Paul, 'we are guiltless of your blood.'"¹

SEC. 149. *The Ephesine Synod is dissolved.*

This, however, made no more impression than their previous efforts. On the contrary, the Emperor now placed himself still more decidedly than before upon the side of the orthodox; and after these had, in accordance with his command, ordained a new bishop for Constantinople in the person of Maximian, a priest of that Church,² he put forth a new decree to the Synod of Ephesus, under which title he understands here no longer, as before, both parties, but only the assembly of the orthodox; but he does not treat even this in a quite friendly manner, and he does not conceal his displeasure at

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1405; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1566.

² We learn this from the single document, already noticed, which we possess from the orthodox side, in Mansi, t. v. pp. 255 and 659; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1667.

the miscarriage of his plans for unity. He says: "As you could not be induced to unite with the Antiochenes, and, moreover, would not join in any discussion of the points of difference, I command that the Oriental bishops return to their churches, and that the Ephesine Synod dissolve. Cyril, too, is to return to Alexandria (to his diocese), and Memnon shall remain bishop of Ephesus. At the same time we also give it to be known that, as long as we live, we shall not condemn the Orientals, for they have not been confuted in our presence, and no one would dispute with them. Moreover, if you wish for the peace of the Church (with the Orientals=Antiochenes), that is, if you will still come to an understanding with them at Ephesus, let me know this immediately; if not, then think of your return home. We are not to blame (that no unity was accomplished), but God knows who must share the blame."¹

An addition to this imperial edict in the *Synodicon*² notifies that Cyril, even *before* the arrival of this decree, had been released from his imprisonment, and had set out on his return to Alexandria. From the previously quoted sole communication from the orthodox side we learn further, that Cyril arrived at Alexandria on the 3d of Athyr, that is, October 30, 431, and was received with great rejoicing. He was, besides, soon gladdened by a very friendly letter from the new bishop of Constantinople.³

The Antiochene deputies do not seem to have been as quick as Cyril in returning home from Chalcedon. At least, after Cyril and Memnon had already been set at liberty, and the imperial edict of dissolution had appeared, they prepared a new statement—their third and last—to their friends, in which they refer to all that has taken place, and promise to make further efforts on behalf of Nestorius, if that be still in any way possible. Until now, however, they say, all their attempts have remained without result, for all here had been

¹ Formerly this edict was known only in Latin in the *Synodicon*, in Mansi, t. v. p. 805. Cotelerius was the first to publish it in Greek, in his *Monim. eccl. Græcæ*, t. i. p. 41, from which it was taken by Hardouin, t. i. p. 1615, and Mansi, t. iv. p. 1465.

² Mansi, t. v. p. 805.

³ Mansi, t. v. p. 258 and 659; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1667.

unfavourably affected by the very mention of the name of Nestorius. At the same time they mention how, in view of the fact that the party of Cyril had endeavoured to ensnare all by violence, flattery, and bribery, they had repeatedly petitioned the Emperor to dismiss them and the Synod from Ephesus. For a longer sojourn there was now entirely useless, since Cyril (the party of Cyril) steadily refused all conference. The Emperor had at last, after repeated admonitions, formed the resolution that all should return to their homes, but that Cyril and Memnon should retain their dignities. Now Cyril would be able to ensnare all by his presents, so that the guilty would return to his diocese, but the innocent would be shut up in the cloister.¹

Immediately before their actual departure from Chalcedon the Antiochenes again delivered discourses to the Nestorians who came over to them from Constantinople. Of two of these we still possess considerable fragments. In the first discourse, delivered by Theodoret of Cyrus, he complained that they, the Antiochenes, were prevented from going to Constantinople on account of their steadfastness to Christ, but that, instead, the heavenly Jerusalem was waiting for them. His hearers had crossed from Constantinople over the fearful waves of the Propontis (at Chalcedon the Bosphorus opens into the Propontis) in order to hear his voice, because they believed that in it they could see a reflection of the voice of their pastor (Nestorius). He then went on to praise Nestorius, and invoked woes upon his persecutors. No less pathetically did he proceed to speak on the expression of the orthodox, "God has suffered" (cf. § 153), for which he placed them far down below the heathen.²

After Theodoret, the Patriarch John of Antioch took up the word, and of his discourse also we possess a fragment, in which

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1420, t. v. p. 801; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1579.

² In Mansi, t. iv. p. 1408, t. v. p. 810; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1569. In several copies this discourse of Theodoret has the superscription: "*Dicta in Chalcedone, dum essent abituri.*" That this indication of time is correct, is clear from the subsequent discourse of John of Antioch.—Entirely without foundation was the doubt of Lupus whether this discourse really belonged to Theodoret. Cf. on the other side Garnier in his edition of the works of Theodoret (re-edited by Schulze), t. v. p. 106.

he greets his hearers, and at the same time *takes farewell* of them, exhorts them to stedfastness in the faith, and assures them that from mere believers they have now become *Confessors*. For the rest they must not allow themselves to be misled into the notion that God was capable of suffering, for the natures (in Christ) were only united, not mingled. To that they must hold fast, and God would be with them.¹

SEC. 150. *Slanders on Cyril and S. Pulcheria.*

We saw how the Antiochenes repeatedly accused Cyril and his friends of having brought about by bribery the remarkable revolution in the views and conduct of the court. The most important document on this subject is a letter from the centenarian Bishop Acacius of Bercea, of whom we have already heard, to Bishop Alexander of Hierapolis, who declares that he had heard from John of Antioch, Theodoret, and others, that the Emperor had at first been entirely on the side of the Antiochenes, but that Cyril had bribed the influential eunuch Scholasticus, of whom we have already heard (pp. 81 and 108, note 3), and many others. When he died the Emperor had discovered written proof among his effects that he had received many pounds of gold from Cyril. Paul, a brother's son of Cyril's,² and an official at Constantinople, had arranged for these payments. The Emperor had therefore confirmed the deposition of Cyril and Memnon, but Cyril had escaped from prison at Ephesus, and the monks at Constantinople had, so to speak, compelled the Emperor to dissolve the Synod, and to fulfil their wishes (and among them the liberation of Cyril).³

This report, which Acacius, as he declares himself, had only from hearsay, and which those who communicated it to him again could only have heard from others (they certainly did not venture to come to Constantinople), arouses at the very first glance certain doubts. We know that Scholasticus

¹ Mansi, t. iv. p. 1410, t. v. p. 812; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1571; Theodoret, *Opp.* ed. Schulze, t. v. p. 110.

² He was not a brother's son, but the son of a sister of Cyril's named Isidora. Cf. the paper which his brother Athanasius, a priest of Alexandria, presented to the Council of Chalcedon. Hardouin, t. ii. p. 331; Mansi, t. vi. p. 1022 sqq.

³ Mansi, t. v. p. 819.

had, at an earlier period, been a patron of Nestorius, but that afterwards he inclined to the other side, and in consequence was very likely to become the spokesman of this side with the Emperor. It is also correct to say that, after the conclusion of the conferences at Chalcedon, Theodosius at first reaffirmed the deposition of Cyril and Memnon; but it is scarcely credible that, if he had discovered the bribery, and therefore had renewed the edict against Cyril and Memnon, he would so soon afterwards have again given to both complete liberty, and restored them to their dioceses. To this we must add, that the deputies of the Antiochenes, so long as they were at Chalcedon, and so in the immediate neighbourhood of Constantinople, had not said a single syllable respecting this discovery made at the death of Scholasticus, and yet the thing must have occurred before their departure from Chalcedon (cf. p. 111). And how gladly would they have rejoiced over such a thing if they had known it! Besides, it is not probable that Cyril would have been able and willing to escape from his imprisonment at Ephesus, or if he had actually done so, that the Emperor, instead of inflicting punishment, would have sent after him a decree granting him perfect liberty. Finally, it was not Scholasticus, but the Emperor's sister, S. Pulcheria, as she relates, who was principally active against Nestorius,¹ for which reason she was horribly slandered by his adherents. Nestorius, they said, had once accused her of an unlawful connection with her own brother, and therefore she had hated him so bitterly.²

We will not directly deny that Cyril may at that time have offered gifts to Scholasticus and others, for that he afterwards made presents to the Empress Pulcheria, and to many other high personages, we are told by his own archdeacon and *Syncellus* Epiphanius, as we shall see more fully further on at sec. 156. But this must be judged of not by our customs and circumstances, but by those of the East, according to which no one is allowed to approach a superior without bringing a present with him, however just his cause may be.

¹ S. Leonis, ep. 79 (59), ed. Baller, t. i. p. 1035.

² Suidas, *Lexic. s.v.* "Pulcheria;" Baron. *ad ann.* 431, n. 162; Walch, *Ketzergesch.* Bd. v. S. 551.

The making of presents is absolutely universal in the East, but these presents are not all *bribes*; very many are simply customary recommendations of a cause which, in itself, is thoroughly just. In reference to this custom of the East, the Protestant theologians, who in the 16th and 17th centuries laboured to bring about a union of the Greeks with the Protestants, had not the slightest hesitation in pleasing and conciliating the Greek prelates and dignitaries by presents.¹ And the matter may be stated even more advantageously for Cyril. In any case, he only sought to gain friends and protectors for the ancient faith to which those who were the objects of his gifts entirely belonged, whereas those Protestant theologians endeavoured to draw away the Greek clergy from duties which they had sworn to observe.

¹ Cf. my treatise on Cyril Lucar etc., in the *Tübing. theol. Quartalschrift*, 1843, 553 f., and 563, and in the *Beiträge zur Kirchengesch.* etc., Tübing. 1864, Bd. i. S. 452 and 458.

CHAPTER III.

PROCEEDINGS WITH A VIEW TO UNION BETWEEN CYRIL AND THE ANTIOCHENES. OVERTHROW OF NESTORIANISM.

SEC. 151. *The Rupture still continues. Synods at Constantinople, Tarsus, and Antioch.*

THE rupture which had taken place during the Ephesine Synod unfortunately lasted on after its dissolution for several years, as the Antiochenes persevered in their peculiarly perverse attitude. In the first place, they would not decidedly defend the doctrine of Nestorius, but came forward *occasionally* as its advocates, and endeavoured to protect and cover their own doctrinal indecision by the formally Catholic bulwark: *Nil innovetur* (on the Nicene Creed). In a similar way, the point of view which they occupied in reference to the *person* of Nestorius was purely formal. That *materially* he had been deposed with justice they would neither concede nor deny; but they persistently declared the sentence against him to be *formally* invalid, because it was pronounced by the Synod too early, *before* the arrival of the Antiochenes. Thence it resulted that they in like manner disapproved the election of the new Bishop Maximian for Constantinople, which had taken place on the 25th of October 431,¹ and were compelled decisively to reject it, as the chair was, in their opinion, not vacant. *Positively* and dogmatically they pronounced only upon one point,—namely, the teaching of Cyril,—since they took single expressions of his, which were inadequate to convey his meaning, and liable to be misunderstood, disregarding all the explanations which he had given, and by arbitrary inference charged them with Apollinarianism, Arianism, Eunomianism, and all other

¹ Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 37.

possible heresies. It is peculiar that Walch and other historians have not the slightest word of disapprobation to utter over this imputation of heresy in the gross, while no phrase is strong enough, in their view, to scourge Cyril with for his attitude towards Nestorius. Finally, the Antiochenes persisted in the assertion : Cyril and Memnon were deposed by us, and can no longer hold their sees.

As we have already seen, the appointment of a new bishop for Constantinople was accomplished by the deputies of the orthodox majority of Ephesus, whom the Emperor had summoned to the metropolis for that purpose. At first they thought of the learned priest, Philippus Sidetes, and of Bishop Proclus, who had been unjustly refused possession of his diocese of Cyzicus, and had always distinguished himself by his anti-Nestorian zeal (see p. 14). At last they came to an agreement in the person of the monk and priest Maximian, who, according to the Greek Menologies, was born at Rome, had served long among the clergy at Constantinople, and had gained a very good name by his piety and unpretentiousness. Socrates says of him that he was not exactly learned, and that he was addicted to the quiet and contemplative life.¹ A nature thus peaceful and free from ambition was a real benefit to Constantinople, and well adapted to reconcile parties, so that only one small Nestorian congregation continued for a short time to exist there.

In union with the orthodox deputies of the Synod, and forming with them a kind of Synod (at Constantinople), Maximian communicated immediately to the rest of the bishops intelligence of the election which had taken place, and transmitted to them the decrees of Ephesus, as we learn from his letter to the Bishops of Epirus.² A second letter he addressed to Cyril, in which he congratulated him on his final victory, and his unchangeable, martyr-like steadfastness for the good cause. In his answer Cyril explained to his new colleague in all brevity the orthodox doctrine on the union of the two

¹ Socrates, *l.c.* vii. 35. The Bollandists give a complete account of him, *Acta SS.* t. ii. April, p. 847 sq. (*Commentar. de S. Maxim.*). Cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires etc.*, t. xiv. p. 488.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 257 ; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1669.

natures (without mixture), and indeed this letter alone¹ would suffice to prove the groundlessness of the charges of the Antiochenes, that Cyril mingled the two natures, and thus impaired both. At the same time, Cyril expressed his joy at the election of Maximian in a short letter to the orthodox synodal deputies who had co-operated in securing it.² Similar sentiments were expressed by Pope Cœlestine in his letters to Maximian, to the Church of Constantinople, and to the Emperor Theodosius II.³ They are all dated on the 15th of March 432, and on the same day Cœlestine despatched a fourth letter, full of praise and appreciation, to the Synod of Ephesus, which he regarded as still existing in the deputies present at Constantinople, and which he commended for the election of Maximianus.

In the meantime the Antiochenes had, on their return from the Council, gone as far as Ancyra in Galatia, and were here, to their great annoyance, already treated practically as excommunicated men. Bishop Theodotus of Ancyra, who belonged to the orthodox party of Ephesus and to the synodal deputies, had, in union with his colleague Firmus of Cæsarea, despatched a letter from Constantinople to Ancyra, in which he gave instructions to this effect.⁴ John of Antioch complained of this to the Prefect Antiochus, and apparently about the same time addressed in writing to the Emperor the request that he would suppress the heretical teaching of Cyril.⁵

On their way home the Antiochenes held a Conciliabulum at *Tarsus* in Cilicia, where they pronounced anew a sentence of anathema on Cyril and at the same time on the seven orthodox synodal deputies, and published this decision in a circular letter. We learn this from two letters of Bishop Meletius of Mopsueste (who belonged to the Antiochene party) to Count Neotherius and the Vicar Titus,⁶ and Theodoret of Cyrus also refers repeatedly to the same.⁷ A second

¹ In Mansi, t. v. pp. 258 and 259 sqq.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 265 ; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1671.

³ In Mansi, t. v. p. 269 sqq. ; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1674 sqq.

⁴ In Mansi, t. v. p. 266 sqq. ; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1671.

⁵ In Mansi, t. v. pp. 813, 814 ; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1632 sq.

⁶ In Mansi, t. v. p. 920, c. 141, and p. 953, c. 174.

⁷ In Mansi, t. v. p. 843, c. 66, and p. 917, c. 136.

similar Conciliabulum took place somewhat later at Antioch, and after excommunication had here too been repeatedly pronounced upon Cyril and his adherents,¹ John of Antioch and some of his party proceeded to Berœa, in order to give the aged Bishop Acacius information of what had been done by word of mouth, and to obtain his assent, in which they succeeded.² At the same time Theodoret of Cyrus, Andrew of Samosata, and Eutherius of Tyana took all pains in writings and in learned letters to represent the views and statements of Cyril as heretical,³ and to defend those bishops who, on account of their open leaning to heresy, had been recently deposed by Archbishop Maximian of Constantinople and Archbishop Firmus of Cæsarea, namely, Helladius of Tarsus, Eutherius of Tyana, Himerius of Nicomedia, and Dorotheus of Marcianopolis.⁴ Bishop Rabulas of Edessa, on the contrary, who was so celebrated afterwards, now seceded from the Antiochene party and joined that of Cyril.⁵

SEC. 152. *The Pope and the Emperor attempt to mediate.
Synods at Constantinople and Antioch.*

On the 26th of July 432, Pope Cœlestine I. died, and Sixtus III. was his successor. Gennadius relates, that in the year 430, when he was still a priest at Rome, he had required of Nestorius to yield to Cyril;⁶ but this statement has been pronounced to be inaccurate by later scholars.⁷ It is certain, on the other hand, that Sixtus, soon after his entrance upon office, by circular writings and separate letters, particularly to Cyril, solemnly approved the decisions of the

¹ Socrat. lib. vii. c. 34; Liberat. *Breviar.* c. 6; Mansi, t. v. p. 986.

² Cf. the letter of Bishop Acacius in Mansi, t. v. p. 819.

³ Cf. Tillemont, *l.c.* p. 507 sqq.

⁴ Cf. the letters on the subject in Mansi, t. v. c. 45, p. 822; c. 48 and 49, p. 825 sq.; c. 70, p. 846, and c. 71, p. 847. On the difficulties which may be raised on this incidental point, especially the question of competence, cf. Tillemont, *l.c.* p. 496 sq.

⁵ Mansi, t. v. p. 821 sq., c. 43, 44; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1633 sq. Cf. Tillemont, *l.c.* p. 504 sqq.

⁶ Gennadius, *De Script. eccl. in Vita Cœlestini*, c. 54 in Fabric. *Biblioth. eccl.* p. 26.

⁷ Coustant, *Epistolæ Pontificum*, p. 1231; Walch, *Ketzer-gesch.* Bd. v. S. 578.

Synod of Ephesus, and at the same time endeavoured again to restore the peace of the Church, on the basis that John of Antioch and his adherents should, without further difficulties, be received into communion, if they rejected all which had been rejected by the holy Synod of Ephesus.¹ This mildness and placableness brought him indeed, in some quarters, an ill report, as though he had even regarded the deposition of Nestorius with dissatisfaction; but his letters show the reverse, and Cyril defended him with decision against this accusation.²

The Emperor Theodosius II. also took part in the attempt to mediate, and for that purpose, about the middle of the year 432, held a consultation with Maximian of Constantinople and the other bishops and clergy who were present there (in a kind of Synod), on the ways which might lead to peace. By their advice he wrote to John of Antioch, saying, "It was sad that bishops who are one in faith should fall into such discord, and very sad that the teachers of peace themselves should need an exhortation to peace. John and Cyril should therefore be reconciled, and the holy bishops assembled at Constantinople had declared that, if John would subscribe the deposition of Nestorius, and anathematize his doctrine, then all cause for strife would be removed. Cyril and Pope Cœlestine (who is thus shown to have been then alive, or, at least, whose death was not yet known at Constantinople) and all the other bishops would then immediately return into Church communion with him, and all further smaller scruples could easily be set aside. John should now come to Nicomedia as soon as possible for the conclusion of peace, whither also Cyril was ordered to go by an imperial letter; but neither of them was to bring with him other bishops (who might perhaps destroy the good understanding), but only a few confidential clerics as attendants; nor would either be received by the Emperor until they were reconciled. Finally, until then no new bishop

¹ Compare the two letters of Sixtus in Mansi, t. v. p. 374 sq., and Constant, *Epist. Pontif.* p. 1231 sq. The one of them is directed to Cyril; the other, on the contrary, is a circular letter, which was intended also for the Orientals, although the superscription here also names Cyril as the person to whom it is addressed.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 326.

was to be appointed and none was to be deposed."¹ This letter was sent to Antioch by the hand of the tribune and notary Aristolaus, so that he might personally urge on the affair.

In a second letter, the Emperor requested S. Simeon Stylites, afterwards so highly honoured, that he would by powerful prayer and exhortation co-operate for the peace of the Church.² A similar letter, also asking for intercession with God, he addressed to the aged Bishop Acacius of Beroea and others.³ The imperial letter to Cyril, on the contrary, is lost, and its exact contents unknown. We know only that it required of him a forgetting and a forgiving of the ill-treatment which he had endured at Ephesus.⁴ Tillemont (*l.c.* p. 516) supposes, further, that the Emperor had in it suggested to Cyril that he should repudiate his own anathematisms in the same way as he had required of John the repudiation of the counter-anathematisms of Nestorius (of his teaching generally). But Walch (*l.c.* S. 581 f.) has already declared this to be improbable, because the Emperor certainly regarded Nestorius, but not Cyril, as heretical. And this comes out still more clearly from what follows. John of Antioch was placed in great embarrassment by the arrival of the imperial letter, and wrote to Alexander of Hierapolis, that he was too weak and infirm to travel to Constantinople (properly to Nicomedia, and thence, after peace was concluded, to the Emperor at Constantinople). Besides, he had been told that his enemies might easily do him an injury upon the journey. Alexander, however, with Theodoret and other bishops, after they had held their conference at Cyrus, should come as quickly as possible to him and advise him as to what was to be done, for he did not know what he should answer to the Emperor. His propositions were *aperte impia*, since the chapters of Cyril in an indirect manner contained that which was wrong (the Emperor then had not demanded their repudiation of Cyril), and he was required to pronounce anathema on those who recognize two natures in Christ (no one had required this,

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 278; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1683.

² In Mansi, t. v. pp. 281 and 828; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1685.

³ In Mansi, t. v. pp. 283 and 828; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1687.

⁴ Cf. Cyrilli *Epist. ad Acac. Melit.* in Mansi, t. v. p. 310.

and John misrepresents the matter). He adds that the *Magister Militum* (Plinthas) urged him greatly to accept the imperial propositions.¹

John, however, sought to gain time, and held a Synod, first at *Antioch* and then in a city of Syria which is unknown to us, with the Bishops Alexander of Hierapolis, Acacius of Bercea, Macarius of Laodicea, Andrew of Samosata, and Theodoret of Cyrus.² They here drew up six propositions, probably framed by Theodoret, with the condition that they would receive into Church communion whoever would accept one of them, without, however, on their side recognizing the deposition of Nestorius. They themselves describe, as the first and most important, the proposition: "That the creed of Nicæa must be maintained without any additions, and with the rejection of all other explanations, which were given in letters and *chapters* (of Cyril), and only that explanation of it must be accepted which S. Athanasius had drawn up in his letter to Epictetus of Corinth (against the Apollinarians)."³ This first proposition alone is still preserved, and it was placed before Cyril and his friends, together with the epistle of Athanasius in question, as we learn from a letter of the Antiochenes to Bishop Helladius of Tarsus.⁴

SEC. 153. *Aristolaus travels to Alexandria. The Hopes of Peace increase.*

With this first proposition and a letter of the aged Acacius to Cyril the State official, Aristolaus, who has already been named, travelled to Alexandria in order the better to advance the work of peace in this place by carrying on negotiations with Cyril.⁵ Cyril speaks of his arrival in his letters to

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 827.

² On these Synods compare the treatise of Mansi, t. v. p. 1155 sqq.

³ In Harduin, t. i. p. 1634; Mansi, t. v. p. 829, c. 53; p. 830, c. 54, and p. 840, c. 60. John of Antioch speaks of *ten* propositions, in Mansi, *l.c.* c. 77, p. 855.

⁴ In Mansi, t. v. p. 830, c. 54; Harduin, t. i. p. 1635. German in Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 204.

⁵ Cf. the heading of c. 53, in Mansi, t. v. p. 829, and Harduin, t. i. p. 1643; *Propositiones* etc.

Bishop Acacius of Melitene, to Bishop Donatus of Nicopolis in Epirus, and to Bishop Rabulas of Edessa,¹ to the effect that "the friends of Nestorius had abused the venerable Acacius of Beroëa by writing to him that which was unfitting, and requiring of him that he should withdraw and repudiate all that he had written against Nestorius, and should hold merely to the Nicene Creed. But that he had answered them, We hold firmly by all that is in the Nicene Creed; but what I have rightly written against Nestorius it is impossible that I should declare to be false, and it is, on the contrary, necessary that you should, in accordance with the imperial command and the decree of Ephesus, repudiate Nestorius, anathematize his teaching, and recognize the election of Maximian."

He gives here in brief the substance of that which in fact he explained more fully² in his answer to Acacius of Beroëa (for this letter, too, we still possess), with the remark that from love to God and the Emperor he willingly forgave all the injuries inflicted upon him by the Antiochenes. In proceeding further, he asserts that he is unjustly accused of Apollinarianism or Arianism, etc.; on the contrary, he anathematizes Arianism and all other heresies, confesses (in opposition to Apollinaris) that Christ had a reasonable human soul (*πνεῦμα*), further, that no mixing and mingling and no confusion of the natures in Christ had taken place; but, on the contrary, that the Logos of God is *in its own nature* unchangeable and incapable of suffering. But in the flesh one and the same Christ and only-begotten Son of God suffered for us.—Further, that his (Cyril's) chapters had their strength and power only in opposition to the errors of Nestorius, were intended only to overthrow his false statements, and that he who condemned the latter should certainly cease to find fault with the chapters. If Church communion were again restored, he would by letters pacify all, and explain all the misunderstood passages of his writings to their satisfaction; but repudiate them he could not, for they were doctrinally accurate, and in accordance with truth, and approved by the whole of the rest of the Church. In

¹ In Mansi, t. v. pp. 309, 347, and 887.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 831 sqq.

conclusion, he speaks of the earnest efforts for peace of Aristolaus, and greets the receiver of his letter, together with all the bishops assembled around him.

Cyril had consented to give the more exact explanations which were sent, in consequence of the urgent wish of Aristolaus, as his archdeacon, Epiphanius, informs the bishop of Constantinople,¹ and these were in fact very well adapted to rebut the false reproaches and accusations of his opponents. Besides, Cyril could give them without in the least departing from his original teaching, as is clear from a comparison with what was said before (pp. 21 and 29 ff.), and only ignorance or prejudice can accuse him of a departure from his original principles.

Aristolaus sent his companion and assistant Maximus to the East with this letter of Cyril's, along with the request that the Antiochenes would now collectively anathematize Nestorius and his teaching.² At the same time, the Pope also and some other bishops addressed letters to Acacius³ for the promotion of peace. Acacius handed the documents which he received over to his Oriental colleagues, and at the same time, in his letter to Alexander of Hierapolis, expressed his present satisfaction with Cyril without the least reserve.⁴ As was to be foreseen, this decided friend of Nestorius was of a quite different view, and maintained in his answer to Acacius that Cyril, notwithstanding the explanation which he had given, was still an Apollinarian, and that Nestorius should not be anathematized before it was proved that he had taught that which was contrary to Scripture. He wrote in a still more violent style to his fellow-partisan, Andrew of Samosata,⁵ full of astonishment at the changeableness of Acacius, and declaring that "he would rather give up his office, yes, rather lose a hand, than have communion with Cyril, unless he anathematized his errors, and acknowledged that Christ is God and man, and that He suffered in His manhood" (it is well known that Cyril did not deny this).

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 988.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 830, c. 55; p. 840, c. 61, and p. 988, c. 203.

³ Acacius refers to this in Mansi, t. v. p. 830, c. 55.

⁴ In Mansi, t. v. p. 831, c. 55. ⁵ In Mansi, t. v. p. 835, 837 sq.

Andrew of Samosata now adopted the same tone in his answer to this letter. Cyril is to him a deceiver, and he supposes that they are already giving in at Antioch, and that it was not wrongly that he had lately dreamt that Bishop John of Antioch had allowed himself to pronounce a eulogy upon Apollinaris.¹

Acacius had also written to Theodoret, and invited him to a personal interview; but the latter, being prevented by sickness and visitors, expressed himself in writing to the effect that the most recent explanations of Cyril did not please him badly. They were less in harmony with his earlier utterances, and more with the teaching of the Fathers. On the other hand, it was very blameworthy that Cyril, instead of simply accepting one of the six propositions thus modified, which had been drawn up, had given out much verbiage and circumlocution, and had not chosen the short and simple way to peace. He also required that the Antiochenes should sign the deposition of Nestorius, but they had not even been present at his condemnation, and it would be imposing a great burden upon their conscience to do anything which they regarded as unjust. In conclusion, Acacius should so manage the affair that the peace should be pleasing to *all*, but especially to *God*.²

Theodoret expressed himself somewhat more exactly in his letter to Andrew of Samosata. He commends the act of Cyril in pronouncing anathema upon Apollinarianism, etc.; but, he said, it was not possible that the Antiochenes should anathematize the teaching of Nestorius *en bloc* (*indeterminate*), as it appeared to them correct. It would be something quite different if Cyril had required an anathema on those who teach that Christ was a mere man, or who divide the one Lord Jesus Christ into two Sons.³ Theodoret knew well that such statements were decidedly heretical, but he professed to see in them, particularly in the latter, not a *consequence* of Nestorianism, but only an unfounded charge which was brought against it. His offer to repudiate these propositions, without, however, alluding to Nestorius himself, has accord-

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 839.

² Mansi, t. v. p. 840, c. 60.

³ Mansi, t. v. p. 840 sq. c. 61.

ingly no other foundation than the Jansenistic distinction between *question du fait* and *du droit*—that is, that those propositions should be as of right (*du droit*) repudiated, but the *questio facti*, as to whether Nestorius taught them, was to be answered in the *negative*.

Andrew of Samosata hereupon answered that he was quite in agreement with Theodoret's proposition, that they should promise Cyril to pronounce anathema on those who call Christ a mere man, and on those who divide the one Lord into two Sons. Moreover, if Cyril should persist in requiring that they should subscribe the deposition of Nestorius, but should be satisfied if they did not all give their signature, but only some of them, it was probable that some would do this. In conclusion, he asked that Theodoret would pray that peace should be hindered by no obstacle.

We see how much more placably Andrew here speaks than formerly in his answer to the violent Alexander of Hierapolis. In order, however, to bring the latter to greater mildness, he now sent him the letter of Theodoret, recommends submission, depicts the disadvantages of persisting in schism, and wishes that Alexander too would accept the new proposal.¹ The latter, however, again expressed himself fanatically and bitterly in two letters to Andrew and Theodoret, and saw only a temptation of Satan in the whole of the proceedings for peace. He is peculiarly indignant at John of Antioch, and swears by his soul's salvation not to yield a foot's breadth.² Theodoret replied to him quietly and calmly, that he knew the patriarch better, and that neither he nor himself would agree to the condemnation of Nestorius. On the other hand, the new declaration of Cyril seemed to him to tend to peace, and he was curious to learn how it could be contradictory to the gospel. As for the rest, he agreed that it did not yet suffice to justify the reception of Cyril into communion again; in order to this, more exact expressions in the sense of the Nicene Creed would be necessary.³

Bishop Maximin of Anazarbus inclined to the side of

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 841 sq. c. 62 and 63.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 842, c. 64, and p. 843, c. 65.

³ In Mansi, t. v. p. 843, c. 66.

Alexander, and informed him by letter that John of Antioch had commended the latest explanations of Cyril; while in the copy which a friend had given him, Cyril expressed his resolution of simply maintaining his previous assertions. He hoped then that Alexander would give him an explanation on this point.¹—We may remark that Maximin had seen correctly, for in fact it was only the perverse *meanings* which were attributed to the earlier words of Cyril, and not these words themselves, which were contradictory to his latest explanations. Hence it comes that Theodoret and John of Antioch, and all those who had falsely apprehended the earlier words of Cyril, were certainly compelled to assume that there was a considerable difference between his present and his earlier utterances, while in the eyes of a genuine Nestorian they were equally Apollinarian, and made too little distinction between the natures of Christ.

The third violent zealot and decided Nestorian was Bishop Helladius of Tarsus, who, in his letter to Alexander of Hierapolis, already treats those of the Antiochenes who were disposed for peace as traitors. Alexander commends him for this, and rejoices that the Churches of both Cilicias are so distinctly on the side of the preacher of truth—namely, Nestorius.²

On the other side, Theodoret sought to win this Helladius of Tarsus for his more peaceful view, and therefore wrote to him that the new explanations of Cyril might be accepted, but not his demand that they should anathematize Nestorius. Besides, all deposed bishops of the Antiochene side (see above, pp. 67 f. and 118) must be restored again before they could receive Cyril into Church communion. Helladius would please soon to communicate to him his view on this subject, and would also win over Bishop Himerius of Nicomedia to the same views, and convince him that he (Theodoret) had not betrayed the cause of religion. At the same time, he explained to this Himerius, in a separate letter, his view, with which we are acquainted, of the new explanations of Cyril and the possible acceptance of them, with the

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 844, c. 67.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 845 sq. c. 68 and 69.

addition, that this was not merely *his* view, but also that of John of Antioch, and of all the bishops with whom he had held a Synod.¹ In a subsequent letter to the head of the violent party, Alexander of Hierapolis, Theodoret defends himself against the reproach of treachery, and against the suspicion that he had become submissive for the sake of a better position, or in order to escape persecutions.²

Finally, Archbishop Eutharius of Tyana, in Cappadocia in two letters to John of Antioch and to Helladius of Tarsus, expressed himself very decidedly against the party of peace, and very violently against reconciliation with Cyril.³

We see that, on the question of the peace of the Church, the Antiochenes were divided into two great parties. The peace-seeking majority, who had John of Antioch and the venerable Acacius at their head, were opposed by a minority disinclined for reconciliation; but the majority, too, fell into two divisions, while Theodoret and Andrew of Samosata formed a kind of middle party, and wished to make new proposals (see above, p. 124 f.).

SEC. 154. *Paul of Emisa is sent to Alexandria as Mediator.*

In union with his partisans the Patriarch John immediately sent the aged Bishop Paul of Emisa as envoy to Alexandria, so that he might by word of mouth have further communication with Cyril, and obtain still clearer explanations from him. At the same time the Patriarch John now for the first time since the outbreak of the rupture came into personal correspondence by letter with Cyril, in the letter of introduction written for Paul of Emisa, and still extant in Latin, saying that, "although personally unknown to each other, he and Cyril had been united in love with one another, but unfortunately the twelve anathematisms of Cyril had destroyed this unity, and it would have been good if their publication had never taken place. He had at the beginning

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 846 sq. c. 70 and 71.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 849, c. 72.

³ In Mansi, t. v. p. 850 sqq. c. 73 and 74.

been unable to believe that they proceeded from Cyril. By his most recent explanations, however, they had been essentially improved, and it might be hoped that this would be completely accomplished. Cyril himself had promised, after the restoration of peace, still further to remove disquiet, and some few additions were in fact necessary. John and his friends were in a high degree rejoiced by the letter of Cyril to Acacius (which contained the explanations referred to), especially because he had so readily accepted the letter of S. Athanasius to Epictetus, which so correctly explained the Nicene Creed, and removed all difficulties. The work of peace thus begun should now be continued, and the mutual revilings and accusations of heresy of the Christians among themselves must cease. Cyril might receive Paul in a friendly manner, and trust him fully, as though John himself were present."¹ According to an expression of Cyril's archdeacon, Epiphanius, the Patriarch John had also explained that the Orientals would never consent to the condemnation of Nestorius;² the letter now before us, however, does not contain, at least directly, a syllable of this. On the other hand, we may say with Theodoret, that John therein decidedly repudiated the anathematisms of Cyril.³

With this step, the sending of Paul of Emisa, the Patriarch John made Bishop Alexander of Hierapolis, the head of the strict party, acquainted, in reply to a letter of the latter which is now lost. John blames his dialectical subtlety, which is disposed to see Apollinarianism everywhere in Cyril, and shows briefly and incisively that the confession of Cyril, that the natures of Christ are not mingled, is entirely opposed to the principle of Apollinarianism. None of those who dwell in Pontus (probably Firmus of Caesarea and other opponents of the Antiochenes) had thus expressed themselves. It were indeed well if he, who was in Alexander's neighbourhood (probably Rabulas of Edessa), and those beyond the Taurus (a mountain range in the south of Asia Minor), would make the same confession. Alexander must not be pusillanimous, but trust in God. He was always speaking of not drawing back, even of

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 856 sqq.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 983.

³ Theodoret, *Epist.* 112, t. iv. *Opp.* p. 1186, ed. Schulze.

being prepared for martyrdom, but this was not now necessary, but only the restoration of the peace of the Church. The other contents of the letter have to do with little belonging to this subject, consisting of scarcely intelligible details.¹

Alexander answered in an unfriendly spirit, and tried to show that Cyril, even in his new explanations, was still heretical. If, however, John and Acacius could find them orthodox, then the journey of Paul of Emisa was really superfluous. He, for his part, would hold communion neither with Cyril nor with those who were reconciled with him, so long as he had not spoken out in a thoroughly satisfactory manner. The matter was simple: "Cyril offers us communion if we become heretics."²

The patriarch answered quite calmly and quietly that he would not go into all the bitternesses in the letter of Alexander, but would pray for one thing, that he might still put some hope in the journey of Paul, since he would have to lay before Cyril the ten propositions of the Antiochenes, and communication by word of mouth often led to a better result than was accomplished by writing.³

The Patriarch John had, moreover, acquainted not merely the bishops of his province, but also foreign friends and partisans, e.g. Archbishop Dorotheus of Marcanopolis in Mœsia (in Europe), with his latest steps, and had received from him and his suffragans a very sympathetic letter in return, in which John was only still asked to see that Cyril acknowledged two unmingled natures, and repudiated his anathematisms.⁴

SEC. 155. *The Union-Creed of the Antiochenes: it is accepted by Cyril.*

John of Antioch had given to Paul of Emisa, along with the above-mentioned letter, a form of faith drawn up by him and his friends, which Cyril was to be required to accept. We learn this from the subsequent letter of Cyril to John,⁵

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 853.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 916.

³ In Mansi, t. v. p. 855, c. 77.

⁴ In Mansi, t. v. p. 855, c. 78.

⁵ In Mansi, t. v. p. 303; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1703.

and from a letter of John to Cyril;¹ and it is clear at the first glance that this, apart from the introduction and some concluding words, is quite the same formula which the Antiochenes at Ephesus had previously presented through Count John to the Emperor Theodosius, and of which we have already spoken above (p. 93 f.). It falls into two divisions—the introduction and the creed itself. In the first it is said, “That which we believe and teach concerning the virgin God-bearer, and concerning the manner of the incarnation of the only-begotten Son of God, we will now, because it is necessary, briefly set forth in accordance with Scripture and tradition, not in order to add anything, but in order to give satisfaction to others, without adding anything whatever to the faith explained at Nicæa. As in fact we said before, that is quite sufficient for the knowledge of religion, and for the refutation of heretical error. And we give this new explanation, not because we venture to explain the incomprehensible, but in order by the confession of our own weakness to refute those who reproach us with discussing that which is to man incomprehensible.”²

Next followed the second part, the creed itself: “We confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, true God and true man, consisting of a reasonable soul and a body, was begotten before all time by the Father according to the Godhead, but at the end of the days, for us and for our salvation, was born of the Virgin, according to the manhood, of one substance with the Father as touching the Godhead, and of one substance with us as touching the manhood. For two natures are united together (*δύο γὰρ φύσεων ἑνώσις γέγρονε*). Therefore we acknowledge one Christ, one Lord, and one Son. On account of this *union*, which, however, is remote from all *mingling* (*κατὰ ταύτην τὴν τῆς ἀσυγχύτου ἐνώσεως ἔννοιαν*), we acknowledge also that the holy Virgin is the God-bearer, because God the Logos was made flesh and man, and before conception united with Himself the temple (the manhood), which He assumed from her (the

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 291; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1691.

² The conclusion of this introduction resembles the shorter introduction of the earlier form of the same creed. See p. 93 f.

Virgin)."¹ As regards, however, the evangelical and apostolical utterances respecting Christ, we know that theologians apply them differently: the one class, having reference to the *one person*, apply them to both natures in common; the other class, referring to the two natures, separate them. The confessions which are suitable to God they refer to the Godhead, and those which apply to the humiliation to the manhood.²

We have already remarked (p. 94) that this formula was quite orthodox in meaning, and therefore Cyril consented without difficulty to further its acceptance, and gave his adhesion to it, which he afterwards repeated in his celebrated letter to John of Antioch after the actual conclusion of peace. After Cyril had done this, he then first began to discuss with Paul the outrages which had been inflicted upon him at Ephesus; but after a considerable time had elapsed in discussing them, and also on account of his illness,³ he allowed this personal matter to drop, and turned to the more important question as to whether the Orientals were now inclined to agree to the condemnation of Nestorius, which was the *conditio sine qua non* of their Church communion; and whether Paul had with him a letter from John on this subject. Paul then communicated to Cyril the letter of his patriarch, which we have already described, and Cyril was so little satisfied with it that he declared that this paper did not at all contain what it ought (namely, the agreement on the subject of Nestorius), and that it embittered the controversy rather than softened it,

¹ To this point the creed is identical with that on p. 93 f. The remainder is a new addition.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 303 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1703. The original text of this creed is as follows: 'Ὁμολογοῦμεν τοιγαροῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν μονογενῆ, Θεὸν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος' ἀπὸ αἰῶνος μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐκ' ἰσχυάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν εἰότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα· δύο γὰρ φύσεων ἕναισις γίγνεται διὸ ἕνα Χριστὸν, ἕνα υἱόν, ἕνα κύριον ὁμολογοῦμεν' κατὰ ταύτην τὴν τῆς ἀσυγχύτου ἑνώσεως ἔννοιαν ὁμολογοῦμεν τὴν ἀγίαν παρβὴν θεοτόκον, διὰ τὸ τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον σαρκωθῆναι καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαι, καὶ ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς συλλήψεως ἑνώσει ἑαυτῷ τὸν ἐκ αὐτῆς ληφθέντα νόον' τὰς δὲ ἐυαγγελικὰς καὶ ἀποστολικὰς περὶ τοῦ κυρίου φωνὰς ἴσμεν τοὺς ἐολόγους ἄνδρας τὰς μὲν κοινοποιούντας, ὡς ἐκ' ἑνὸς προσώπου, τὰς δὲ διαιρούντας, ὡς ἐκὶ δύο φύσεων' καὶ τὰς μὲν ἐισπρίστεις κατὰ τὴν εἰότητα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὰς δὲ ταπεινὰς κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα αὐτοῦ παραδίδόντας.

³ Mansi, t. v. p. 988 and 311.

since it sought to justify all that had been done at Ephesus as having proceeded from a dutiful zeal for pure doctrine. Cyril therefore refused to receive this document, and was at last induced to do so only by the apologetic explanations of Bishop Paul, who made oath that it was not so intended.¹ Paul then declared that he was ready to anathematize the heresies of Nestorius, and that this should suffice as though all the Oriental bishops had done the same. Cyril replied with justice that Paul could act for himself, and that then he could be, without delay, received into communion, but that this could not possibly suffice for the rest of the Oriental bishops, particularly for their patriarch, since there needed an express commission from him for that purpose, and therefore he must be asked to give a written declaration on the subject.² Paul of Emisa then in his own behalf presented a written document to the effect that he acknowledged Maximian as bishop of Constantinople, and Nestorius as deposed, and that he excommunicated his heresy,³ and was then not only solemnly received into Church communion by Cyril, but was also repeatedly invited to preach in Alexandria. We have still (parts of) three homilies of his, which he preached there at that time.⁴

When, however, Paul abandoned Nestorius, he requested in return that the deposition pronounced upon Helladius, Eutherius, Himerius, and Dorotheus (four Nestorians) by Cyril and Maximian (see above, p. 118) should be removed. Without this concession, he maintained, peace could not possibly take place. Cyril, however, replied that this could never be, and that on his part he would not agree to it, so that Paul let this point drop.⁵

All this, especially on account of Cyril's illness, had taken up a good deal of time, and the Orientals were complaining already that it was so long since they had any intelligence from Alexandria, and that the whole transaction seemed to

¹ Cf. his *Epist. ad Acac. Melet.* in Mansi, t. v. p. 311, and his *Epist. ad Donat. ibid.* p. 350.

² Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 313, 350.

³ This document in Mansi, t. v. p. 287; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1689.

⁴ In Mansi, t. v. p. 293 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1693 sqq.

⁵ In Mansi, t. v., p. 350.

have no result. We see this from a letter of Bishop Andrew of Samosata to Alexander of Hierapolis.¹ Now, however, the imperial commissioner Aristolaus sent a letter to the Antiochenes, in which he urgently demanded of them the wished-for declaration respecting Nestorius.

SEC. 156. *Synod of the Antiochenes: Cyril's Presents.*

The Orientals upon this held a new Synod at Antioch, and drew up new resolutions of which we have no very definite knowledge, and made Aristolaus acquainted with them through Verius (the Antiochene deputy at Constantinople), adding that soon Bishop Alexander (probably of Apamea) would appear with the new resolutions at Alexandria.² That these were not favourable is shown by that which followed; but even Cyril's own friends at Constantinople sent him, about this time, highly disagreeable information, and they had become very languid in their zeal for the good cause, as we learn from the frequently quoted letter of Cyril's archdeacon, Epiphanius.³ It is certain that the latter, with Cyril's knowledge and consent, wrote now to Bishop Maximian of Constantinople, informing him that Cyril had fallen ill again in consequence of this bad news, blamed the lukewarmness of Maximian and other friends, and exhorted them to new zeal. In particular, he urged that they should bring it about that Aristolaus should once more go in person to Antioch (that the obscure words, *hinc exire faciat* Aristolaum, are to be taken in this sense, is shown by the course of the history). At the same time he mentions that Cyril has written to Pulcheria, the Præpositus Paulus, the Chamberlain Romanus, and the two court ladies Marcella and Droseria, and has sent them valuable *benedictiones* (presents). To the Præpositus Chrysoretus, who was unfavourable to the Church, Aristolaus was ready to write, and to him also were *eulogia* (presents) sent. Further, Cyril had entreated Scholasticus and Arthebas, at the same time sending them presents, to influence Chrysoretus at last to abstain from his persecution of the Church. Bishop Maximian himself was asked to pray the Empress Pulcheria

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 859.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 938.

³ In Mansi, l. c.

again to show zeal for Christ, for she and all the persons at court at present had but little care for Cyril, perhaps because the presents, although not of trifling value, were yet insufficient to satisfy the covetousness of the courtiers. Pulcheria should write to the Antiochene, *ordering* him to submit; but Aristolaus must be required to be urgent with John. Further, Maximian should entreat the Archimandrites Dalmatius and Eutyches (afterwards the heretic), to adjure the Emperor and the court officials in reference to Nestorius, and to support Cyril with all their might. The little note which accompanied this mentioned the presents which had been given to each, so that Maximian might see how much the Alexandrian Church had sacrificed. They had even been compelled to obtain a loan for the purpose. Now the Church of Constantinople should also do its duty and satisfy the cupidity of certain persons. Finally, Pulcheria should use her influence to have Lausus made *præpositus* soon, so that the power of Chrysoretes might be weakened.¹

That Cyril put every engine in motion, so as to obtain a victory for the cause of orthodoxy, will hardly be imputed to him as a fault by the unprejudiced. That he also had recourse to presents is a circumstance which we will defend as little as did Tillemont (*l.c.* p. 541); while, at the same time, we must explain it and excuse it, as we have said already (p. 113 f.), by the peculiar customs of the East.

SEC. 157. *The Union takes place.*

Cyril now in fact attained his end. Aristolaus allowed himself to be induced to go again with Paul of Emisa to Antioch, and two of Cyril's clergy, Cassius and Anmon, had to accompany them and present for his subscription to the Patriarch John a document on the deposition of Nestorius and the anathematizing of his teaching, and in case of his subscribing, to hand him the document of his restoration to Church communion.² This way appeared to Cyril to lead

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 987 sqq.

² Cyrilli *Epist. ad Theognostum*, etc., in Cyrilli *Opp.* t. v. P. ii. p. 153, and his *Epist. ad Donat.* in Mansi, t. v. p. 350.

much more quickly to the goal, especially as Paul of Emisa and Aristolaus of Alexandria carried on the affair too slowly. Besides, this way seemed safe enough, since Aristolaus declared on oath that the document of union should certainly not be given up *before* the signature of the other document, and if John of Antioch refused to sign, he would immediately travel to Constantinople and explain that it was not the Church of Alexandria, but the Bishop of Antioch, that was the disturber of the peace.¹

The proceedings at Antioch came to a happy termination. John on his part wished still for a few slight and insignificant alterations in the document which he had to sign, and as, according to his own statement, and as his subsequent letters show, the sense was not thereby altered, the two delegates of Cyril, with the concurrence of Aristolaus and Paul of Emisa, consented to them.² Thereupon the Patriarch John, together with the bishops assembled around him, addressed friendly letters to Cyril, to Pope Sixtus, and to Bishop Maximian of Constantinople, which are still extant, and are interesting evidences of the restored unity. The most important of them is directed to the three heads of the Church just named, and says: "In the year which has just passed, at the command of the pious Emperors, the holy Synod of the God-beloved bishops came together at Ephesus in order to oppose the Nestorian heresy, and, in accord with the legates of the blessed Pope Coelestine, deposed the aforementioned Nestorius, because he used unholy doctrine (βεβήλων διδασκαλία χρώμενον), scandalized many (σκανδαλίσαντα πολλούς), and in regard to the faith did not stand upright (οὐκ ὀρθοποδήσαντα)."³ We arrived subsequently at Ephesus, found that the matter had been already settled, and were dissatisfied therewith. For this reason there arose a difference between us and the holy Synod, and after much had been done and spoken backwards and forwards, we returned to our Churches and cities without

¹ Cyrilli *Epist. ad Theognostum*, l.c.

² Compare the letter of John to Cyril among the letters of the latter, in Cyrilli *Opp. t. v. P. ii. div. 2, p. 153.*

³ Probably these terms proceed from the Antiochenes, and belong to the alterations in the text of Cyril of which we have spoken.

having subscribed the sentence of the holy Synod on Nestorius, and the Churches were disunited by a difference of opinion. As, however, all must really have had it in view to seek restoration of union by the removal of differences of opinion, and the God-fearing Emperors required this, and in order to bring it about sent the tribune and notary Aristolaus, we also determined to agree to the judgment pronounced against Nestorius, to recognize him as deposed, and to anathematize his infamous doctrines (*δυσφήμους διδασκαλίας*), since our Church, like your Holiness, has always had the true doctrine, and will ever preserve it and transmit it to the nations. We also agree to the consecration of the most holy and God-fearing bishop, Maximian of Constantinople, and have communion with all the God-fearing bishops of the world who retain and hold fast the orthodox and pure doctrine.”¹

The second letter of John is addressed to Cyril alone, and begins, like the first, with the remark that the Antiochenes had not taken part in the Council of Ephesus, but considers it now, in the time of peace, superfluous to go into the causes of the past discord, and prefers to go on to the efforts for the restoration of peace which followed, particularly to the sending of Aristolaus and Paul of Emisa, repeats the declaration of faith asked by the Antiochenes from Cyril, and proceeds as follows: “After thou hast received this formula of faith, we, in order to remove all controversy, to unite all the Churches of the world, and to remove all offences, have resolved to acknowledge that Nestorius is deposed, and to anathematize his evil and corrupt new doctrines (*τὰς φαύλας αὐτοῦ καὶ βεβήλους καινοφονίας*),” and so forth, as in the first letter.²

The third letter of John is again addressed only to Cyril, and is of a more confidential nature. He begins with the joyful exclamation: “We are again united,” then says that Paul of Emisa is returning to Alexandria with the documents of peace, speaks of his great services in the cause of union, as well as of those of Aristolaus and the two Alexandrian clerics, assures Cyril of his most friendly disposition, prays him to

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 285 ; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1687.

² In Hardouin, t. i. p. 1691 ; Mansi, t. v. p. 289 sqq. In Latin only, *ibid.* p. 667 sqq.

accept this peace with goodwill, and promises to do all he can to induce all the other Oriental bishops to join it.¹—He did this honestly, and we still possess a letter belonging to this time from him to Theodoret, in which he joyfully informs him that Cyril has now made it impossible falsely to explain his words as teaching only one nature, and has recognized the diversity of the natures. The complete confession of his orthodoxy, however, Paul of Emisa would soon bring back from Alexandria.²

Cyril did in fact now transmit, by the medium mentioned, his celebrated letter *Latentur Cæli* to John of Antioch, as answer to his Eirenicon, in which, according to the wish of the Orientals,³ he repeated verbally not only the introductory declaration given by them, which we adduced above at p. 130, and the creed of the Antiochenes which followed upon it, but also added still further doctrinal explanations, in order to completely remove all suspicion.

As this letter of Cyril's, often also called "Ephesine Creed," has obtained great celebrity, we quote the following portions of it. After Cyril had, as has been said, expressed his full agreement with the above-mentioned introduction and the creed of the Antiochenes, he designates as slanderers those who accuse him of maintaining that the body of Christ comes from heaven, and not from the holy Virgin. The whole controversy, he says, has arisen from this, that he called Mary the "God-bearer." But this expression he could not possibly have used, if he had regarded the body of Christ as having come down from heaven. Whom else had Mary then borne, but Emmanuel after the flesh? If, however, we say that "our Lord Jesus Christ is from heaven," we mean not that His flesh came down from heaven, but we follow the holy Paul, who exclaims: "*Ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*" (1 Cor. xv. 47). Christ is also called *ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*, as He, perfect according to the Godhead, and perfect also according to His manhood, is to be comprehended as one Person. For the Lord Jesus Christ is One, although the difference of the natures, from which the unutterable union took place, is not

¹ In Cyrilli *Opp.* t. v. P. ii. p. 153 sq.

² In Mansi, t. v. p. 867, c. 86.

³ So Facundus relates, lib. i. c. 5.

to be ignored. Those, however, who speak of a mixture (*κρᾶσις ἡ σύγχυσις ἡ φυρμός*) of the Logos with the flesh, must be checked by thee. I know that some accuse me of such language; I am, however, so far removed from it, that I hold as senseless those who suppose that any change can take place in the divine nature. Moreover, we all teach that the Logos of God is incapable of suffering, although He attributes to Himself the suffering of His flesh (*κατ' οἰκειώσιν οἰκονομικῇν*). . . . We do not in any wise allow that any one should alter a single word or omit a syllable in the Nicene Creed, for it was not those (318) Fathers who spoke there, but the Spirit of God and the Father, who proceeds from Him, but is also not foreign to the Son in regard to His essence (*οὐσία*). . . . Finally, Cyril remarks, as the letter (so often quoted in the Nestorian question) of S. Athanasius to Epictetus was circulating in falsified copies (falsified by the Nestorians), he appended accurate copies of the original which was at Alexandria.¹

To his own Church Cyril announced the joyful event of the restoration of peace in a sermon, of which a fragment in a Latin translation, and with the date 28th of Pharmut, *i.e.* April 23 (probably of the year 433), has come down to us.² Tillemont infers from this that the union in question was probably concluded in March 433, which, besides, is not in itself improbable, even if that date in the superscription of a mere translation can have no great importance.³

The happy restoration of peace was immediately communicated by Cyril to Pope Sixtus and to Bishops Maximian of Constantinople and Donatus of Nicopolis.⁴ The Patriarch John, however, in announcing the fact to the two Emperors, Theodosius II. and Valentinian III., added a petition that they would see to the restoration of the deposed bishops.⁵ In a circular letter to the rest of the Oriental bishops, he informed these also of what had been done, communicated to them the letters of

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 301 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 119 sqq.

² Mansi, t. v. p. 289; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1689.

³ Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. xiv. p. 547, and note 76, *Sur St. Cyrille*, *ibid.* p. 782; Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. v. S. 617.

⁴ Mansi, t. v. pp. 347, 351; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1707.

⁵ Mansi, t. v. p. 871.

reconciliation which had been exchanged between Cyril and him, assured them that Cyril was quite orthodox, and entreated them not again to break this beautiful unity.¹ Finally, Pope Sixtus also, greatly rejoiced at their being won back, wrote at last, on September 11, 433, to Cyril, and four days later to John of Antioch, to acquaint them with the sympathy of the Holy See with that which had been accomplished.²

SEC. 158. *The Union finds Opponents, but is defended by Cyril.*

The judgments which were soon pronounced upon this work of pacification were very different. The great majority of Christians were in a high degree delighted at it, and congratulated Cyril on his meritorious efforts in the good cause. But there were four classes who were discontented; two classes of his own previous adherents, and two classes of his previous opponents. Of the latter, the one—the enraged Nestorians—decidedly refused, as we shall see more particularly hereafter, to enter the union; while the others affirmed that Nestorius himself had taught nothing different from that which Cyril now acknowledged, and endeavoured to conceal their Nestorianism under the expressions of the creed subscribed by Cyril. Cyril therefore found himself under the necessity of opposing them and their tergiversations,³ in a comprehensive letter to Bishop Valerian of Iconium. But even of his own previous adherents there were many who were dissatisfied with Cyril, and thought that he had yielded more than was right, had sacrificed his original doctrine, had allowed himself to accept Nestorian terms, and had not imitated those great men of the ancient Church, who endured lifelong banishment rather than give up one iota of the dogma. This reproach was brought against him peculiarly by S. Isidore of Pelusium,⁴ the same who had previously blamed him for passionateness against Nestorius (see above, p. 83). According to the testimony of Liberatus, similar accusations were made by Bishop Acacius of Melitene

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 751.

² Mansi, t. v. pp. 371, 379; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1707 sqq.; cf. Pagi, *Criticu in annal. Baron. ad ann. 433*, n. 1-4.

³ In Mansi, t. v. p. 353 sqq.

⁴ Isidor. Pelus. *Epist.* lib. i. no. 324.

and Valerian of Iconium, as well as by several persons at the imperial court.¹

As already indicated, these accusers of Cyril, who came from his own camp, also fell into two classes, those who brought these reproaches merely from a *misunderstanding*, as undoubtedly was the case with Isidore of Pelusium; and those who, really holding Monophysite or Monothelite opinions, understood correctly indeed the new explanations of Cyril, but thought themselves decidedly bound to disapprove of them. The ecclesiastical mean represented by Cyril appeared to them, from their extreme point of view, to be Nestorian. To this class perhaps belongs Acacius of Melitene, who in a letter to Cyril,² still extant, commends his efforts for the anathematizing of Nestorianism (and Theodore of Mopsuestia),³ but at the same time adjures him to pronounce anathema also upon those who maintain that, after the union of the natures in Christ, there still remain two natures, and that each of them has its own operation or activity. This evidently, he said, led to Nestorianism.—He was wrong, for that which here seems to him to be Nestorianism is the orthodox doctrine; he himself, however, stood, although probably without knowing it, at the Monothelite point of view, when he refused to ascribe two operations to the two natures of Christ, or even at the Monophysite, if he meant entirely to deny the duality of the natures.

All this led Cyril to defend himself and the union which had been concluded in a series of treatises. (1) First of all he met the accusation of having required from any one, or having accepted, a new (altered) creed. The matter, on the contrary, stood thus: As the Oriental bishops at Ephesus had fallen under suspicion of holding Nestorian opinions, it had been necessary that they should give an explanation of their faith for their own vindication.⁴ (2) Secondly, he shows that this declaration of faith of the Orientals was in fact satisfactory, and that there was a great difference between their faith and that of Nestorius. The latter really denied the

¹ *Liberati Breviar.* c. 8, p. 669.

² It is still extant in two Latin translations in Mansi, t. v. pp. 860, 998.

³ This is probably a later addition.

⁴ Mansi, t. v. p. 315, in Cyril's letter to Bishop Acacius of Melitene.

Incarnation of the Logos, and rent the one Son in two. The Orientals, on the contrary, because of the unutterable and unmingled union of the Godhead and the manhood (*διὰ τὴν ἄφραστον καὶ ἀσύγχυτον ἔνωσιν*), call the holy Virgin "the God-bearer," and confess one Son and Christ and Lord, perfect in the Godhead and perfect in the manhood, because His flesh was quickened by a reasonable soul (in opposition to Apollinarianism). Thus they in no way divide the one Son, Christ, and Lord Jesus into two, but they say: He who was from eternity and who appeared on earth in the last time is one and the same; the former is of God the Father as God, the latter is of woman after the flesh as man. We teach that an union of the two natures has taken place (*δύο φύσεων ἔνωσιν γενέσθαι*), and acknowledge openly only one Christ, one Son and Lord.¹ We say not, as the heretics, that the Logos prepared for Himself a body out of His own divine nature, but we teach that He assumed flesh of the holy Virgin. If we now regard (hold in our thoughts) that from which He is, the one Son and Lord, we say that two natures are united; but *after* the union we believe that, while the division into two is now removed (*ὡς ἀννηρημένης ἤδη τῆς εἰς δύο διατομῆς*), the nature of the Son is one, as that of the one, but incarnate (*μίαν εἶναι πιστεύομεν τὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ φύσιν ὡς ἑνὸς πλήν ἐνανθρωπήσαντος*),² and far be all suspicion of a transformation (of the natures) having taken place. The *ἔνωσις* is an *ἀσύγχυτος*.³ (3) Some said: "How can Cyril commend those (the Orientals) who accept two natures? That is certainly a Nestorian expression." Cyril replies: "That Nestorius teaches two natures is quite true, for in fact the nature of the Logos is different from that of the flesh; but he is wrong in this, that he does not acknowledge with us an *ἔνωσις* of the natures. We unite them and thus receive one Christ, one Son, and one incarnate nature of God (*μίαν τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ φύσιν σεσαρκωμένην*). Something similar may be said in reference to every man. Every human being consists of two different parts, body and soul, and the intelligence and the

¹ Mansi, t. v. pp. 317 and 323, in the same letter.

² How Cyril understood this, see below, p. 142 f.

³ Mansi, t. v. p. 319, in the same letter, and p. 345 in the letter to Eulogius.

perception (*θεωρία*) separate the two; but uniting them we make only one nature of man (*ποιοῦμεν μίαν ἀνθρώπου φύσιν*). To recognize the difference of natures, then, is not to divide the one Christ into two."¹ In another place he says: "The *φύσις* of the Logos is recognized as only one: merely in reference to the Incarnation of the Logos can the difference of the natures or hypostases be thought of (*ἡ τῶν φύσεων ἡγουν ὑποστάσεων διαφορά*). If the question is asked as to the manner of the Incarnation, the human intelligence sees two things unutterably united with each other, but unmingled; yet it in nowise separates that which is united (*ὅταν τοίνυν ὁ τῆς σαρκώσεως πολυπραγμονῇται τρόπος, δύο τὰ ἀλλήλοις ἀπορρήτως τε καὶ ἀσυγχύτως συνηνεγμένα καθ' ἑνωσιν ὁρᾷ δὴ πάντως ὁ ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς, ἐνωθέντα γε μὴν διύστησιν οὐδαμῶς*), but recognizes in both one God and Son and Christ."²

We can see that Cyril held firmly the traditional expression: *μία φύσις τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*, but in such a way that he does not thereby deny the distinction of natures. On the contrary, he says expressly: "Godhead and manhood are not alike in natural quality" (*ἐν ποιότητι φυσικῇ*),³ and will only assert: "The one and unique principle or subject or Ego in the God-man is the Logos, He is also the bearer of the human in Christ." As with Athanasius, so with Cyril, as often as he uses the expression, the idea of *φύσις* approaches to that of *nature* or *personality* (see above, p. 3); as we have seen, with reference to this subject he uses *φύσις* and *ὑπόστασις* as identical. It is true that Cyril says repeatedly: Only when one holds firmly in thought that of which Christ consists, can two natures be distinguished (*ἐν ψιλαῖς καὶ μόναις ἐνοίαις δεχόμενοι*);⁴ but it would be wrong to understand this as though in his view the two natures were not *real*, but were mere abstractions, *φωναὶ*, *verba*, and that, after the union, only one nature really remained. Against this notion we have (a) The example used by Cyril of the union of soul and body in man, where, however, both factors remain after the union as always real. Besides, (β) Cyril repeatedly asserts that no mingling

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 343, in the letter of Cyril to Eulogius.

² Mansi, t. v. p. 319, in the letter to Acacius of Melitene.

³ Mansi, t. v. p. 319.

⁴ In Mansi, t. v. p. 320.

or transmutation¹ of the natures of the Christ consists, is to be received, which is the same as to say that neither of them has lost its reality through the union. To this we must add (γ) that the whole accusation, that Cyril regarded the two natures in Christ as only *φωναὶ*, rests upon a mere misunderstanding, for he understands by this not the *natures*, but the *attributes* and *predicates* (*ιδιώματα*), as that which follows shows. (4) The opponents had represented to Cyril that "the Antiochenes speak of two natures, and mean that in reference to this the *φωναὶ* of those who speak of God (*i.e.* the predicates used of Christ) are distinct. Is this not a contradiction of your doctrine? You certainly do not allow these *φωνὰς* to be divided into two *πρόσωπα* or *ὑποστάσεις*." Cyril replied that he had certainly, in his fourth anathematism, anathematized those who so separate the *φωνὰς* as to attribute the one merely to the Logos, and the other merely to the man; but he had certainly not denied the difference of the *φωναὶ* (*φωνῶν διαφορὰς*).² The Orientals accept (in thought *ἐν ἐννοίαις*) a difference (*διαφορὰν*) of natures, but allow no separation of them (*διαίρεσιν φυσικὴν*), like Nestorius, and only allow a division of the *φωναὶ* which are used with reference to our Lord. They do not say: "The one class of these *φωναὶ* refer only to the Logos of God, the other only to the Son of man" (for the Son of God and the Son of man are one), but: "The one refer only to the Godhead, the other to the manhood." Other *φωναὶ*, however, they say again, are common and apply to both natures. And in all this they are right, for some *φωναὶ* refer principally to the Godhead, others more to the manhood, others are of an intermediate kind; but both those which refer to the Godhead and those which refer to the manhood are ascribed only to one Son.³ (5) John of Antioch had written in a letter to some acquaintances that "Cyril now recognizes the difference of the natures, and divides (*διαίρειν*) the *φωναὶ* between the natures." Former

¹ *E.g.* Mansi, l.c. p. 320: *διερίφθω που μακρὰν τροπῆς ὑποψία*, and the *ἕνωσις* is *παντελῶς ἀσύγχυτος*. So at p. 345 in the letter to Eulogius, where he declares it to be a lie to ascribe to him the Apollinarian doctrine *ὅτι σύγχρασις ἐγένετο ἡ σύγχυσις*.

² Mansi, t. v. p. 319, in the letter to Acacius of Melitene.

³ In Mansi, t. v. p. 322, in the same letter, and p. 345 in the letter to Eulogius.

friends of Cyril took offence at this, on which account he declared as follows, that his opponents had suspected him as though, like Apollinaris, he had denied to the manhood of Christ a reasonable soul, and asserted a mingling or transmutation of the Logos into flesh. In the same way they had said that he agreed with Arius, because he would not recognize the *διαφορὰ* of the *φωναί*.¹ He had defended himself against these accusations, and had written to John that he maintained neither a transmutation of the Logos into flesh nor of the flesh into the divine nature, nor had he denied the *διαφορὰ* of the *φωναί*. The words quoted, however, *διαρπεῖν*, etc., were not his, but proceeded from the Antiochenes.²

The apology for his Eirenicon was put forth by Cyril principally in his letters to Bishop Acacius of Melitene,³ and to his own envoy at Constantinople, the priest Eulogius,⁴ in the letter already quoted to Valerian of Iconium, and also in two letters to Bishop Successus or Succensus of Diocæsarea in Isauria.⁵ The latter appears to have partially occupied the Apollinarian point of view, and from this to have addressed reproaches to Cyril, in two admonitions which he sent to him. Cyril, in answer to the first, defends the Antiochene expression, "two natures," clearly explains his own doctrinal position, and in conclusion opposes the Apollinarian or Eutychian proposition advanced by Succensus, that after the resurrection the body of Christ was transformed into the Godhead.⁶ In his second letter, on the contrary, which at the conclusion corresponds with that addressed to Acacius of Melitene, he shows that his words: *μία φύσις τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*, did not lead to the Apollinarian (better, Monophysite) consequences which, in the first admonition of Succensus, had been deduced from them. At the same time Cyril speaks in two letters of the Nestorians as then circulating various

¹ The Arians, as is well known, had referred to the Logos those expressions of the Scriptures which implied subordination, and had reference to the manhood of Christ.

² Mansi, t. v. p. 323 sq. in the same letter.

³ In Mansi, t. v. p. 309 sqq.

⁴ In Mansi, t. v. p. 343 sqq.

⁵ In *Opp.* Cyrilli, t. v. P. ii. p. 135 sqq. and p. 141 sqq., among the letters of Cyril.

⁶ Cyrilli *Opp.* l.c. p. 138 sqq.

spurious letters drawn up by themselves, particularly one from the Roman priest and legate Philippus, according to which Pope Sixtus had disapproved of the deposition of Nestorius; a second from Cyril himself, full of professed regret for his conduct at Ephesus,¹ and others again from distinguished Oriental bishops containing their renunciation of the reconciliation which had been effected. Cyril asserts most distinctly that the first two are entire forgeries, and that the latter are also certainly spurious.²

As we have already seen, John of Antioch had informed all the Oriental bishops of the conclusion of the union by an encyclical letter, and had invited them to accept it, and in particular had informed Theodoret of Cyrus, but at an earlier period, of the now undoubted orthodoxy of Cyril. Theodoret's answer was unfriendly. The union in itself (from the dogmatic point of view) he did not blame, and thus implicitly recognized the orthodoxy of Cyril, but he demanded that all the bishops who had taken sides in the controversy with the Antiochenes, and had for that reason been deposed (see above, p. 118), should be restored to their sees, otherwise the peace would be dishonourable and he could not come into it. But the Patriarch John must use his influence with the Emperors to secure that restoration. At the same time he informed him that Bishop Himerius of Nicomedia (one of the four deposed) went much further, and declared him, Theodoret, together with the patriarch, to be a traitor to their cause.³

The Eirenicon of Andrew of Samosata, Meletius of Mopsuestia, and Dorotheus of Marcianopolis in Mœsia,⁴ was attacked more from the doctrinal side, and most strongly by Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis, and charged with too great a leaning to Apollinarianism. Alexander, as violent as ever, added, moreover, invectives against his Patriarch, John, declaring that he would refuse communion to him and all the allies of Cyril, even if it should cost him his life. He had already prepared a memorial on the subject, and had not yet circulated it publicly, only because he wished first to communicate it to Andrew of Samosata and Theodoret.⁵ In a

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 326.

² *Ibid.* p. 370.

³ *Ibid.* p. 863.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 870, 873, 892.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 874, c. 93.

second letter, addressed to the latter, he reminds him how he had protested at Ephesus against the word *θεοτόκος*, and now he would rather a thousand times suffer death than hold communion with Cyril and those who accepted the blasphemous word. This word alone contained a complete heresy, however many explanations might be appended to it.¹ In a third letter, also intended for Theodoret, he accuses Paul of Emisa of having from the first mutilated the document of the Orientals which had been transmitted to Alexandria (*i.e.* the declaration of faith which they presented to Cyril), in order that Cyril might the more easily accept it.² Theodoret confirmed this accusation, and invited Alexander and Andrew of Samosata, with other colleagues, to a Synod at Hierapolis or at Zeugma (both lay in the Syrian province of Euphratensis), in order to take counsel with them as to what was further to be done in reference to the union.³

Informed of this by Alexander, Andrew of Samosata declared himself quite ready to go to Zeugma, remarking that he had no need to deliberate on the subject of Nestorius, because he was quite convinced of his innocence. It was quite otherwise with Alexander. Theodoret besought him to come to Zeugma as soon as possible;⁴ but he answered evasively, and while he would not directly withdraw from participation, at the same time he does not believe that John of Antioch will, as Theodoret requires, pronounce an anathema on the propositions of Cyril, and just as little that Cyril had, as Theodoret reported, altered his teaching. On the contrary, the new declarations of Cyril were as impious as the old. For the rest, he would come to the Synod if Theodoret would first obtain from John of Antioch an anathema on the propositions of Cyril, and a refusal to accede to the deposition of Nestorius. These were the two points on which John had given him offence, and if Theodoret and the others did not take the same offence at them, then a meeting with them would be superfluous.⁵ In fact, although he was metropolitan of the province of Euphratensis, he did not appear at the Synod at Zeugma, as we learn from the still extant

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 874, c. 94. ² *Ibid.* p. 878, c. 96. ³ *Ibid.* p. 879, c. 97.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 880, c. 93, 99. ⁵ *Ibid.* p. 881, c. 100.

documents of the Synod. These are, first, a letter of Theodoret to John of Antioch, which undoubtedly belongs to this subject, in which it is said that the assembled bishops recognized the recent declarations of Cyril as orthodox, and had seen in them a recantation of the error contained in his anathematisms. Whilst they rejoiced at this, they could not, however, concede that Cyril should require that the Orientals should pronounce an anathema on Nestorius, and John should inform them whether such was actually demanded. In conclusion, Bishop Alexander was requested to reconsider his violence.¹

The other documents belonging to this subject are : a letter of Bishop Andrew of Samosata to Alexander,² two letters of Alexander to him,³ and a letter from Alexander to John of Germanicia.⁴ We see from these that Alexander had not been present at the Synod of Zeugma, and did not approve of its resolutions ;⁵ that, on the contrary, Andrew of Samosata, John of Germanicia, and Theodoret acknowledged, at the Synod, the orthodoxy of Cyril, but not the deposition of Nestorius. Theodoret, in particular, explained in a still extant letter to Nestorius, that he had found the writings of Cyril free from every stain of heresy, but that, on the other hand, he was equally convinced of the innocence of Nestorius, and would rather lose both hands than agree to his deposition.⁶ He wrote the same to Bishop Theosebius of Chios in Bithynia.⁷ Another and much more violent letter, which is equally attributed to Theodoret,⁸ cannot, as Tillemont⁹ long ago pointed out, have proceeded from him, since in it Cyril is distinctly charged with heresy. Such was the view of Alexander of Hierapolis, who persisted in this opinion and refused communion not only to his Patriarch, John,¹⁰ but also to Theodoret of Cyrus, Andrew of Samosata, and all who regarded Cyril as orthodox, and summoned them before the judgment-seat of God.¹¹

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 876, c. 95.

² *Ibid.* p. 882, c. 101, and p. 884, c. 103.

³ *Ibid.* p. 883 sq. c. 102 and 104.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 885, c. 105.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 885, c. 105.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 898 sq. c. 120.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 869, c. 88.

⁸ *Ibid.* p. 899, c. 121.

⁹ *Mémoires*, t. xiv. p. 553, and note 78, *Sur St. Cyrille*.

¹⁰ His last letter to John, in Mansi, t. v. p. 916, c. 136.

¹¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 884 sqq. c. 104.

His point of view was taken by many other Oriental bishops of the province of Euphratensis, of the two Cilicias, of Cappadocia Secunda, Bithynia, Thessaly, and Moesia, chiefly Bishops Euthérius of Tyana and Helladius of Tarsus, who now wrote to Pope Sixtus, asking him to make common cause with them against the union.¹ They invited also the accession of Alexander of Hierapolis and Theodoret of Cyrus, and that of the former with success.² At the same time the bishops of Cilicia Secunda assembled in a Synod at *Anazarbus*, in which they declared that the union was void, that Cyril was a heretic as before, and that every one should be excommunicated who was in communion with him until he had completely repudiated his impious chapters. To this resolution the bishops of Cilicia Prima also assented.³

SEC. 159. *The Union is at last, although not without constraint, accepted universally.*

In consequence of what has been mentioned, Theodoret and his friends took an intermediate position between this party of utter hostility to the union on the one side, and the Patriarch John with the decided friends of union on the other side. While Alexander of Hierapolis and the Synod of Anazarbus entirely repudiated the union, and persistently declared Cyril to be a heretic, Theodoret and the Synod of Zeugma did not deny the orthodoxy of Cyril, but would accept the union only upon the condition of saving Nestorius. John of Antioch was dissatisfied with both sides, and thought it the best way to compel the universal acceptance of the union in his patriarchate by the application of punishments and threats. In this he thought the Emperor should help him and apply the secular arm for the purpose. He therefore addressed a letter to the prefect of the Pretorian guard, Taurus, expressing his satisfaction that, after the death of Maximian, the (anti-Nestorian) Proclus of Cyzicus had been raised to the see of Constantinople, and praying that the court would take measures to re-establish peace and to bridle the obstinate.⁴

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 893 sqq.

² *Ibid.* p. 892, c. 116, and p. 898, c. 118.

³ *Ibid.* p. 890, c. 113, and 891, c. 114.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 904.

At the same time Verius, his secretary at Constantinople, of whom we have already heard, exerted himself to obtain an imperial *Sacra*, to the effect that the Oriental bishops must be in communion with John or leave their sees. The Nestorian Meletius of Mopsuestia (see above, p. 145) reproaches him with having spent much money for this purpose on the court officials, and adds that he has certainly attained his end, but that the carrying out of the decree was still postponed for some time, until peaceful efforts for the re-establishment of union should once more be made. Others, on the contrary, professed to know that the Emperor had recalled the command which he had given, in order to avoid making the excitement still greater in some of the provinces.¹

In order to induce the bishop of Cilicia to reunite with the Patriarch John, the imperial Quæstor Domitian now wrote to the Cilician Metropolitan Helladius of Tarsus, who was hostile to union, with reference to the imperial rescript.² John of Antioch, however, informed Bishop Alexander of Hierapolis, that, in accordance with the imperial command, no bishop must appear at court (where they would intrigue against the union), and that he should communicate this to the bishops who were subject to him.³ Alexander certified that this letter had been read in his presence, but he had not received it personally, as it came from the Bishop of Antioch.⁴

Andrew of Samosata acted quite differently. Hitherto belonging to the middle party, he found, by the influence of the earnest friends of union, and especially of Bishop Rabulas of Edessa, a feeling of hostility stirred up against him among a number of his own diocesans, and therefore had left his diocese, in order, as it appears, to visit Rabulas, and to take counsel with him. At the same time he also left the middle party of Theodoret and came into full communion with his patriarch, without wishing to make any further stand on the condition in reference to Nestorius. Indeed he now became a zealous promoter of union, and endeavoured to induce the clergy of Hierapolis, in opposition to their

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 905.

² *Ibid.* p. 906.

³ *Ibid.* p. 907, c. 126.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 907, c. 127.

bishop, Alexander, to take part in the work of pacification.¹

Theodoret continued longer in his middle position, and for a time was even driven by some violent steps on the part of John further to the left side. In a letter to Meletius of Neocæsarea, he complains particularly that John illegally appointed bishops in foreign dioceses (over which he was patriarch, but not metropolitan), and even chose for them unworthy persons. He had for this reason broken off communion with him.² A second letter he, in common with Alexander, Abbibus, and others, addressed to the bishops of Syria, Cilicia Prima and Secunda, and Cappadocia Secunda, again full of complaints respecting the attempts at union, and the arbitrary ordinations of John.³ The bishops of Cilicia Prima and Secunda answered, with letters full of sympathy, in the like spirit of hostility to the union.⁴ Theodoret further addressed a letter of complaint to a *Magister Militum*, and described how his opponents had endeavoured to set fire to his basilica of SS. Cosmas and Damian, but had been prevented by the people. They had also driven from his house Bishop Abbibus of Doliche in Syria, who was at the point of death, and had declared him to be mad; and in his place John of Antioch had set up the vicious Athanasius, and in another see the ill-famed Marinian, in defiance of all the canons.⁵ Abbibus himself had before given information of what had been done to Theodoret and other friends, with the addition that John had required a recantation of him; but that he had neither conceded this, nor voluntarily resigned his bishopric.⁶ About the same time Dorotheus of Marcianopolis transmitted to Alexander and Theodoret a copy of the pastoral letter in which the new bishop of Constantinople, Proclus, had declared the Orientals to be heretics, and asks whether they should not with one accord address the Emperor;⁷ and, in fact, Alexander of Hierapolis and his suffragans Theodoret, Abbibus, etc., in short, the bishops of the *Provincia Euphratensis*, now addressed a letter of complaint

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 821, c. 43; p. 885, c. 101; p. 885, c. 106.

² *Ibid.* p. 907, c. 128.

³ *Ibid.* p. 910, c. 130, and p. 911, c. 131.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 914, c. 134.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 908, c. 129.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 912 sqq. c. 133.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 918, c. 137.

against John of Antioch to the Empress Pulcheria.¹ They did not, however, attain their end in the least; on the contrary, there appeared an imperial *Sacra* (of which we now possess only a fragment), in which the efforts for peace are commended, and the disturbers of unity threatened.² In particular, Meletius of Mopsuestia was exhorted (although in vain),³ by the imperial Count Neotherius, to be reconciled to John; the like exhortation was addressed by Dionysius, *Magister Militum* (for the East), to Alexander, Theodoret, Helladius (of Tarsus), and Maximinus (of Anazarbus), with the alternative either to surrender their episcopal sees, or to come into communion with John.⁴

At the same time the Emperor entrusted to Count and Vicar Titus a commission to hasten the execution of these alternatives.⁵ This was effectual. First, the bishops of Cilicia Secunda, with their Metropolitan, Maximin of Anazarbus, returned to communion with Cyril and John of Antioch.⁶ The same was requested by nearly all the bishops and clergy of Cilicia Prima, and even their Metropolitan, Helladius of Tarsus, began now to waver. This is shown by his letter to Meletius of Mopsuestia, whom he asks for counsel;⁷ and although the answer dissuaded him,⁸ yet Helladius found himself constrained, by the example of Cilicia Secunda and by the wish of his own suffragans, to come into the union, although, as he declares, with a heavy heart.⁹ Theodoret, too, the spiritual head of the middle party, had counselled him to it,¹⁰ since, after long hesitation and negotiation, he had now become friendly to the union. The Count and Vicar Titus, already named, had sent a special official to him with a letter to the then famous monks, Jacob of Nisibis, Simeon Stylites, and Bardatus, and had threatened them all with deposition unless they would be reconciled with John. Theodoret at first laughed at this threat, and intended to resign his bishopric, but the monks so urged him that he yielded so far as to have a conference with John of Antioch.¹¹ Alexander of Hierapolis, with whom he was still in accord, and

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 915, c. 135.

² *Ibid.* p. 920, c. 140.

³ Cf. the answer of Meletius, *ibid.* p. 920 sq. c. 141.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 923, c. 143.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 922, c. 142.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 938, c. 160; p. 941, c. 164.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 923, c. 144.

⁸ *Ibid.* p. 924, c. 145.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 941, c. 161.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* p. 938, c. 160.

¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 925, c. 146.

to whom he communicated this (*l.c.*), was very much annoyed with these monks, and persisted in his opinion as to Cyril's heresy.¹ Theodoret replied to him that the formularies (the union documents) had been laid before him, and that one of the provisions seemed less insidious, inasmuch as it required no approval of that which had been wrongly done at Ephesus (the deposition of Nestorius). As for the rest, he heard that the present bishop of Constantinople, Proclus, was orthodox in his teaching. Alexander would, he hoped, impart to him his view of the conditions of peace which the bishop of Antioch had laid down. The bishops illegally ordained by him must be deposed. That John had consented to the condemnation of Nestorius was incorrect; but he had certainly done so in a mild form, and had not condemned his teaching directly, but had only said: "We anathematize whatsoever he has taught or thought in opposition to the sense of the Church."²

Alexander replied, that it was not the unlawful depositions and the like, but the doctrinal point, which he regarded as the principal matter; and so long as Cyril did not recant his heresy, he would not have communion with him or with those who recognized him.³ Theodoret endeavoured again to make him more submissive,⁴ but Alexander remained obstinate,⁵ and Theodoret now concluded peace with the Patriarch, after he had, in the interview just mentioned, satisfied himself of his orthodoxy, and John had conceded, that, whoever was unwilling, should not be required to subscribe the deposition of Nestorius.⁶

On the same conditions the bishops of Isauria also joined the union,⁷ but Alexander of Hierapolis, Meletius of Mopsuestia, Abbibus of Doliche, Zenobius of Zephyrium in Cilicia Prima, Euthérius of Tyana, Anastasius of Tenadus, Pausianus of Hypata, Julianus of Sardica, Basilus of Larissa, Theosebius of Chios, Acilinus of Barbolissus, Maximinus of Demetrias in Thessaly, and the three Mæsan bishops, Dorotheus of

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 926, c. 147.

³ *Ibid.* p. 928, c. 149.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 931, c. 152.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 944, c. 166, and p. 946, c. 168.

² *Ibid.* p. 927, c. 148.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 930, c. 151.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 938, c. 160.

Marcianopolis, Valcanius, and Eudocius, were deposed and expelled from their sees.¹

The Emperor (Theodosius II.) further gave command, in the year 435, that Nestorius, who since the year 432 had lived in his former monastery at Antioch, should be banished to Petra in Arabia.² Probably in consequence of a second decree he was, however, brought to Oasis (perhaps to the city of Great Oasis) in Egypt. He still lived there in the year 439, at the time when Socrates wrote his Church history. The irruptions of barbarous tribes caused him to leave this place again and flee to the Thebaid; but the imperial governor had him conveyed, against his will and not without severe constraint, to Elephantis, at the outermost boundary of the Thebaid, and subsequently to Panopolis. When and where he died is unknown. The anti-Nestorian zeal of the Emperor was now, however, so great that he ordered all the writings of Nestorius to be burnt, and his adherents for the future to be called by the nickname of Simonians (from Simon Magus), in the same way as the Arians were called Porphyrians³ by command of Constantine the Great. For the rest, he sent anew the tribune and notary Aristolaus, of whom we have already heard, to the East, in order further to bring all the bishops who had entered the union to the positive acceptance of the anathema on Nestorius. That the bishops of Cilicia Prima acceded, they tell us themselves in a letter still extant,⁴ and besides, John of Antioch remarks that also in Paralia (Cyprus), Phœnicia, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Osrhene, Euphratesia, the two Syrias, and Isauria, the same took place.⁵ At the same time Cyril sent to Aristolaus and the patriarch John a new declaration of faith, which the Orientals should be required to subscribe, along with the anathema on Nestorius.⁶ The information, that many Orientals had accepted the expression

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 965, c. 190. The further documents on these irreconcilables are given *ibid.* p. 959 sqq. c. 180-187, and p. 951 sqq. c. 174-179.

² *Ibid.* p. 255, c. 15.

³ Mansi, t. v. p. 413; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1715. A decree put forth by the prefects to secure obedience to this imperial command is given in Mansi, t. v. p. 415, and Hardouin, t. i. p. 1717.

⁴ In Mansi, t. v. p. 967, c. 192; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1721.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 973, c. 197.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 969, c. 194, 195.

θεοτόκος and the anathema on Nestorius, and yet retained the Nestorian doctrine, had induced him to do this. John, however, would hear nothing of a new formula,¹ and Cyril now restricted himself to the request that Aristolaus would urge the acceptance of the three propositions: (a) Mary is the God-bearer; (b) there are not two, but only one Christ; and (c) the Logos, although in His nature incapable of suffering, suffered in the flesh.²

SEC. 160. *Attack upon Theodore of Mopsuestia. Synods in Armenia and Antioch. Overthrow of Nestorianism.*

In order thoroughly to eradicate Nestorianism, Cyril and his friends, especially Bishop Rabulas of Edessa, now also began the war against the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the now long deceased teacher of Nestorius (see above, p. 5 ff.). Since the Emperor had so strictly prohibited the books of Nestorius, his adherents had circulated those of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and of the still older Diodorus of Tarsus, and had translated them into Syriac, Armenian, and Persian. Rabulas of Edessa, therefore, pronounced in church an anathema on Theodore, as Ibas the priest and subsequently the bishop of Edessa tells us in his letter to Maris, which afterwards became so famous.³ Rabulas further drew Cyril's attention to the fact that Theodore was peculiarly the father of the Nestorian heresy,⁴ and, in union with Acacius of Melitene, warned the Armenian bishops of the books of Theodore; while, on the other hand, Cilician bishops assured the Armenians that Rabulas was denouncing the writings of Theodore merely out of personal spite, because the latter had once convicted him of an error. The Armenians now held a Synod, and sent two clerics, Leontius and Aberius, to Bishop Proclus of Constantinople, in order to obtain information as to whether the genuine doctrine was that of Theodore or that of Rabulas and Acacius. Proclus, in an excellent letter, which is still extant, wrote decisively against Theodore, of whose errors he earnestly warned them.⁵ This letter was

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 972, c. 197.

³ *Ibid.* t. vii. p. 241; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 527.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 421; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1723.

² *Ibid.* p. 996, c. 219.

⁴ *Ibid.* t. v. p. 976, c. 200.

also signed by Cyril and John of Antioch, with his bishops. At the same time Cyril, on his own behalf, wrote a work, of which we possess only fragments, against Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, whom he described as the source of the Nestorian heresy. When he afterwards visited Jerusalem he heard here also complaints of the writings of Theodore, and of many Orientals, who, through using them, propagated errors worse than those of Nestorius, so that he now found it necessary to explain the true sense of the Nicene formula,¹ and asked his colleague John, by letter, not to allow the impious doctrines of Theodore to be propagated in Antioch.² In the same sense he also addressed the Emperor.³ As, however, many, especially Armenian monks, went much further than Cyril, and declared decidedly orthodox expressions of Theodore to be heretical, inasmuch as they themselves occupied the Monophysite point of view, not only did John of Antioch take up his defence in a Synod and in several letters,⁴ but also Cyril and Proclus of Constantinople opposed his unjust accusers, and resisted their demand for an anathema on Theodore. The Emperor, moreover, gave order, in an edict addressed to John of Antioch, that the peace of the Church should be maintained, and that it should not be permitted that men who had died in the communion of the Catholic Church should be calumniated.⁵ With this the controversy rested for several years,⁶ especially as Bishop Rabulas died about this time, in the year 435, and the most declared admirer of Theodore, the priest Ibas, who has been already mentioned, became his successor.⁷ The Nestorian heresy, however, in consequence of stringent imperial edicts, and by the deposition of the bishops who were hostile to union, was, after a few years, suppressed throughout the whole Roman

¹ In Mansi, t. v. p. 383.

² Cyrilli *Opp.* t. v. P. ii. *Epist. ad Lampon. et Clericos*, p. 198. Also in Mansi, t. v. p. 993, c. 206.

³ In Mansi, t. v. p. 974, c. 198.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 1182, 1183, 1185.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 1009, c. 219.

⁶ The history is given with great completeness by Tillemont, t. xiv. p. 624 sqq.; more briefly by Baluzius in Mansi, t. v. p. 1181, and by Walch, *Ketzrh.* Bd. v. S. 641-646.

⁷ See above, p. 152, and Mansi, t. v. p. 418; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1719.

Empire. It died out, so to speak, with the exiled bishops; and its last relics were annihilated by the Emperor Zeno in the year 489, when he ordered the closing of the school at Edessa, their last refuge. Some traces of Nestorians have been discovered by Tillemont as late as towards the end of the sixth century;¹ but their special home was no longer in the Roman Empire, but in the kingdom of Persia, where they continued to exist under the name of Chaldaean Christians, and whence they have spread into other countries of the East, to India, Arabia, China, and among the Tartars.² For a long time Seleucia-Ctesiphon, and later Bagdad, was the residence of the Nestorian Patriarch, who, in the thirteenth century, was owned by no fewer than twenty-five metropolitans as their spiritual head. The terrible Tamerlane almost exterminated them; and only on the heights and in the valleys of Kurdistan have about 700,000 Nestorians maintained an existence under a Patriarch of their own, who resided on to the seventeenth century at Mosul, and more recently at Cochanes, near Djulamerk in Central Kurdistan. A portion of the Nestorians, on the other hand, particularly those in the cities, have, at different times and in different sections, become again united with the Catholic Church, and are likewise under a special patriarch as "Chaldaean Christians." Their number, however, has been reduced to an extraordinary extent by wars, pestilence, and cholera.

Much more dangerous for the faith of the Church than the Nestorians were their extreme opponents, the Monophysites, whose heresy was soon discovered, and was smitten with anathema at the fourth Œcumenical Synod at Chalcedon in the year 451, scarcely twenty years after the holding of the Council of Ephesus. Before, however, this new heresy became the subject of synodal proceedings, several other less important ecclesiastical assemblies took place in the meantime, of which we must give an account in the next book.

¹ *Mémoires*, t. xiv. p. 615 sqq.

² On the later history of the Nestorians, cf. Assemani, *Diss. de Syris Nestorianis* in his *Biblioth. Orient.* t. iii. P. ii., and in the *Kirchenlexicon* of Wetzer and Welte, s.v. *Nestorianer* and *Chaldäische Christen*, Bd. ii. S. 448, and Bd. vii. S. 522; Silbernagel, *Verfassung u. gegenwärtiger zustand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients*, Landshut 1865, S. 211 ff., and S. 300 ff.

BOOK X.

THE INTERVAL BETWEEN THE THIRD AND FOURTH ŒCUMENICAL COUNCILS.



CHAPTER I.

THE SYNODS HELD BEFORE THE BREAKING OUT OF THE EUTYCHIAN CONTROVERSY.

SEC. 161. *Synod at Riez in the year 439.*

A CONTESTED appointment to the episcopal see of Embrun (*Ebredunum*) gave occasion, in the year 439, for the Synod at Riez (*Regium*) in Provence (*Synodus Regensis*). As political metropolis of the Gallic province of *Alpes Maritimæ*, Embrun also laid claim to ecclesiastical metropolitan rights. But Archbishop Hilary of Arles, who endeavoured, at the expense of the metropolitans, to extend his *primatial rights* beyond measure (see below, § 165), treated Embrun as one of his suffragan sees, and when, in the year 438, without his concurrence, and certainly in an uncanonical manner, chiefly by lay influence, Armentarius was raised to the see of Embrun, and was consecrated by (only) two bishops, Hilary held, on the 29th of November 439, a Synod at Riez,¹ at which, besides himself, twelve bishops and one representative priest were present from various *political* provinces of South-Eastern Gaul. The names of those present are found in the subscription of the acts. The canons are:—

¹ Cf. on this subject P. de Marca, *De Primatibus*, c. 73, p. 52, where it is shown that Pope Gregory the Great, and afterwards Pope Hilary, rejected the pretensions of the Archbishop of Arles, and restored the metropolitans, whom he had wronged, to their rights.



1. "As the two bishops who consecrated Armentarius did so not from wickedness, but from ignorance, they shall not be excluded from Church communion, but in accordance with the decree of a Synod at Turin (A.D. 401, c. 3; see vol. ii. p. 427), they shall not, during the rest of their life, take part either in an ordination or at a council.

2. "The ordination of Armentarius is void (*irrita*), and a fresh appointment is to be made to the see of Embrun.

3. "In reference to the fact that the Nicene Council (canon 8) treats schismatics much more gently than heretics, it is allowed that a bishop who is so inclined may grant to Armentarius a church in his diocese (but outside the province *Alpina Maritima*) *in qua aut chorepiscopi nomine . . . aut peregrina ut ajunt communione foveatur* (that is, may receive support from the Church).¹ But he must never offer the sacrifice in towns or in the absence of the bishop, or ordain any cleric, or, generally, discharge any episcopal function in the church which is granted to him. Only in his own church he may confirm (*confirmare*) the newly baptized.

4. "Of those whom he has ordained to be clerics, such as have already been excommunicated shall be deposed; but those who are of good reputation may either be retained by the future bishop of Embrun (Ingenuus) or transferred to Armentarius.

5. "Presbyters may give the benediction in families, in the field, and in private dwellings (but not in church), as is the practice in some provinces. Armentarius, however, may also give the benediction in churches, but only in country, not in town churches, and may bless virgins. He shall come after all the bishops and go before the priests.

6. "In order to prevent uncanonical ordinations for the future, when a bishop dies, only the bishop of the nearest diocese, and no other, shall be allowed to go into the bereaved city, in order to superintend the burial, and to guard against irregularities.

7. "After seven days he, too, must leave the city again, and

¹ On the *Comm. Peregr.* cf. below canon 2 of the Synod of Agde, in the year 506 (§ 222), and canon 16 of the Synod of Serida (§ 237). Cf. Kober, *Suspension* etc., S. 8 ff.

no bishop is again to enter it, except at the command of the metropolitan.

8. "When the times are peaceable, in accordance with the ancient (Nicene) law, two Synods shall be held annually."¹

These eight canons are found in the same form in all the ancient manuscripts, with one single exception, that of a codex of the Isidorian collection, belonging to the Church of Urgel, which omits the eighth canon and substitutes two others in its place. The first of these threatens with excommunication all who rise in rebellion against the Church and its leaders; the second, with canon 8, orders, although in other words, the holding of two provincial Synods in each year. Baluzius, who first edited these two canons,² remarks correctly that this last canon is borrowed from the Synod of Antioch of the year 341. It is in fact almost verbally identical with its 20th canon.

SEC. 162. *Synod at Orange, A.D. 441.*

A second Gallican Synod was held November 8, 441, in the church which is known as the *Ecclesia Justinianensis* or *Justinianensis*, in the diocese of Orange. It is therefore called *Justinianensis* or *Arausicana* i., and as Orange lies in the south-east of France, and was subject to the Metropolitan of Arles, S. Hilary presided also on this occasion, and among the sixteen other bishops who were present we find several other members of the previous Synod. Moreover, the neighbouring province of Lyons was also represented by its Metropolitan, Eucherius, who at the same time subscribed in the name of all his suffragans. Occasion for the holding of this Synod was given, as its 29th canon shows, by the provision at Riez, which decided that the institution of provincial Synods should again be brought into action. The thirty canons which were passed

¹ Mansi, t. v. p. 1189 sq., with notes variorum. Without these in Sirmund, *Concil. Gall.* t. i. p. 65 sqq., and Hardouin, t. i. p. 1747. A new revision of the text of these canons was made by the monks of S. Maur in their new collection of the Gallican Synods, of which only the first volume appeared in 1789, reprinted by Bruns, *Biblioth. Eccles.* t. i. P. ii. p. 116 sqq.

² Reprinted in Mansi, l.c. p. 1194 sq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1751; and Bruns, l.c. p. 121.

by this Synod, and which became the subject of many learned and specially of canonistical controversies, are as follow:¹—

1. "If heretics in a mortal sickness wish to become Catholics, then in the absence of the bishop a priest may mark them with the chrism and benediction," that is, may give them confirmation.²

2. "Priests who are allowed to baptize should always be provided with the chrism. Anointing with the chrism we (in Gaul) will allow to be conferred only once;³ and if it has from any reason been omitted at baptism, this must be told to the bishop at confirmation. A repetition of the anointing has indeed, in itself, nothing against it, but is not necessary."

This is probably the sense of this obscure canon, whose place in the text is not quite certain. Sirmond and Petrus Aurelius had a great controversy over it.⁴

3. "When penitents fall ill, then the Communion, the Viaticum, shall be given to them without the reconciling laying on of hands (that is, solemn reconciliation). That alone is sufficient for the dying. If, however, they recover, they must again take their place in the order of penitents, and only after the performance of the proper works of penance receive the regular Communion (*legitimam communionem*), together with reconciling laying on of hands."

Some understand by the Communion, which is here allowed to the dying, only the *communio precum*, but not the holy Eucharist. But they are certainly wrong. Cf. Frank, *Die Bussdisciplin der Kirche*, Mainz 1867, S. 736 and 905; Remi Ceillier, *Histoire des auteurs sacrés*, etc., t. xiii. p. 779. Something similar to this was before ordered by the Synod of Nicæa (canon 13) and the supposed fourth Synod of Carthage, A.D. 398 (canons 76–78); see vol. ii. p. 416 f.

¹ Printed in Sirmond, *Concil. Gallia*, t. i. p. 71; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1783. Best in Mansi, t. vi. p. 434 sqq., and Bruns, *l.c.* p. 122 sqq. (Here with the variations of the S. Maur edition, cf. above, note 1, p. 159.)

² Compare Sirmond's note on this canon in Mansi, t. vi. p. 443 sq.

³ This was otherwise in Rome, where the chrism was applied twice, at baptism and at confirmation; and this is now the universal practice.

⁴ Cf. Mayer, *Gesch. des Katechumenats*, Kempten 1868, S. 188. Du Pin, *Nouvelle Biblioth.* t. iv. p. 367, t. xvii. p. 204, and Sirmond's note in Mansi, *l.c.* p. 444.

4. "To clerics who request penance it is not to be denied."

It is doubtful whether this canon speaks only of private or also of public penance. In ancient times, at least, it was held to be incompatible with the dignity of a spiritual person that he should do penance in public. It was thought preferable to depose him. So says Pope Siricius, about the year 390, in his letter to Himerius, c. 14: *Penitentiam agere cuiquam non conceditur clericorum*.¹ The thirteenth Council of Toledo, on the contrary (can. 10), allows penance to the clergy without deposition, if they have not committed a capital crime.² In a similar sense our canon is to be understood.³

5. "If any one has taken refuge in a church he shall not be given up, but shall be sheltered from respect to the sacred place."

6. "If any one has in this way lost a servant, he shall not take the servant of a clergyman as amends, under penalty of anathema."

7. "If any one shall seek to deprive of liberty one who has been set free in the church, he shall suffer the ecclesiastical penalty."

8. "A bishop shall not ordain the clergyman of another diocese unless he takes him to himself; and not in that case without having consulted the bishop in whose diocese he was formerly."

9. "If any one has ordained men from another diocese, he must, if they are blameless, either employ them himself or obtain for them the forgiveness of their own bishop."

10. "If a bishop founds a church in a strange diocese, with permission of its bishop, which it were besides sinful to refuse, the right to consecrate that church does not belong to him, but to the other bishop. In this church, moreover, he has not the right of institution, but only of presentation. If a layman has built a church, he must ask no other bishop but that of the diocese to consecrate it."

11. "A bishop must have no communion with any one whom another bishop has excommunicated."

12. "If any one becomes suddenly dumb, he may be

¹ In Hardouin, t. i. p. 851.

² Hardouin, t. iii. p. 1745.

³ Cf. Simond's note in Mansi, l.c. p. 444; and Kober, *Deposition* etc. S. 71 f.

admitted to baptism or penance, if he indicates his wish for it by signs."

13. "To those who have lost their reason, all possible blessings of religion (*quæcunque pietatis sunt*) shall be granted" (*i.e.* prayer, baptism, the anointing of the sick; the holy Eucharist, however, was only given to those who had asked for it while they were in possession of reason).¹

14. "Persons possessed, who have already been baptized and have given themselves into the care and guidance of the clergy, may communicate, in order to strengthen themselves against the attacks of the evil spirit, or to purify themselves from them." (Cf. c. 37 of the Synod of Elvira.)

15. "Persons possessed, who are only catechumens, may be baptized when it is necessary or suitable."

16. "Those who have been once publicly possessed by a demon shall not be ordained. If such have been already ordained, they shall lose their office."

17. "At the same time with the *Capsa* (*Ciborium*), the chalice is to be brought and is to be sanctified (*consecrare*) with a small portion of the Eucharist."

The learned Remi Ceillier (*l.c.* p. 782) explains this obscure canon thus: In the ancient Church they had at each solemn mass a host consecrated at an earlier mass laid on the altar; and in the Roman Church at the very beginning of the mass, in the Gallican Church somewhat later, but before the consecration, the deacon brought forward this formerly consecrated host in a special vessel (*Capsa*).² Our canon then requires that this custom shall be retained, and this *Capsa* shall be always placed upon the altar at the same time with the chalice, and further that a particle from this *Capsa* shall be thrown into the chalice. Instead of *inferendus est calix*, some codices read *offerendus* (it is to be offered), but the majority of manuscripts have *inferendus*. Finally, the sense of *consecrare* is explained by the words *hæc commixtio et consecratio* etc., which we still recite at the mixture of the host and chalice.

¹ Cf. Sirmond's note *a. h. l.*

² Cf. on this subject Meckell, *Abhandlung über die römischen Ordines*, in the *Tübingen Theol. Quartalschr.* 1862, S. 81.

18. "The Gospel shall be read in the presence of the catechumens."

19. "They shall not (before the time of their baptism) enter the baptistery."

20. "At family devotions they shall not receive the benediction at the same time with the faithful, but shall separate themselves from the rest and remain separate for the benediction."

21. "If two bishops have ordained a third in opposition to his will, they shall both be deposed, and he who has been thus ordained shall, if he is otherwise upright, receive one of the two sees thus vacated. If, however, they have consecrated him with his consent, he shall also be deposed" (in accordance with c. 4 of *Nicaea*).

22. "Married men shall not henceforth be ordained deacons, unless they have previously vowed chastity."

23. "He who, after receiving ordination to the diaconate, shall have intercourse with his wife, shall be deposed."

24. "Those, however, who, at an earlier period (before the passing of this law), were ordained deacons and have fallen back into married intercourse, are excepted from this punishment. But, in accordance with the decrees of the Synod of Turin (c. 8; see vol. ii. p. 427), they must not be advanced to higher dignity."

25. "Persons twice married, in case they are received into the number of the clergy by reason of their upright conduct, shall not be advanced higher than to the subdiaconate."

26. "Deaconesses shall no longer be ordained, and (in divine service) they shall receive the benediction only in common with the laity (not among those holding clerical offices)."

27. "The vow of widowhood must be made in presence of the bishop, in the *secretarium*,¹ and is to be indicated by the widow's dress which the bishop confers. If any one violates such widows, he shall be punished; and she herself, if she again leaves the condition of widow."

¹ The *Secretarium* is a building adjoining the church, which embraced several divisions, *Diaconicum*, *Salutatorium*, and *Metatorium*, and in which Synods were often held. Cf. Binterim, *Denkw.* Bd. iv. Thl. 1, S. 139 ff. [Cf. *Dictionary of Christ. Antiquities*, s.v.]

28. "If any one breaks the vow of virginity, he is to suffer the ecclesiastical penalty."

29. "That which is here decreed shall henceforth have validity. Those are blamed who have not appeared at the Synod, either personally or by representatives, and have despised the prescriptions of the Fathers, according to which two Synods ought to be held annually, which, however, at present is not perhaps possible. Every future Synod shall be announced at the previous one, and the next shall be held on the 18th of October next year (442) at Lucianum, also in the province of Orange. Those bishops who are not now present shall receive notice of it from Hilary."

30. "If a bishop has become ill or feeble, or if he can no longer speak, he must not have his episcopal functions discharged by a priest in his presence, but shall invite a neighbouring bishop to assist him."

Besides these thirty genuine canons, several other ordinances are ascribed to one Synod by Gratian (in the *Corp. jur. can.*) and others, which, however, have no authority. Mansi (*l.c.* p. 441 sqq.) has also printed them. They treat of excommunication, of the reception of the excommunicated, of the fast on Easter Eve,¹ which, except in the case of children and the sick, was not to end before the beginning of the night; finally, of the fact that on Good Friday and Easter Eve the holy mysteries were not to be celebrated.

SEC. 163. *First Synod at Vaison, A.D. 442.*

The Council which had been ordered by the twenty-ninth canon of the previous Synod to be held on October 18, 442, at Lucianum, took place not there, but at Vaison (*Vasio*), a neighbouring episcopal city (*Concilium Vascense*), on November 13, 442. The subscriptions to the Acts have been lost, and therefore we do not know what or how many bishops were present there, or who presided. Ado, archbishop of Vienne, in the ninth century, mentions his predecessor, Nectarius of Vienne, as president of this Synod; but it is hardly credible

¹ Cf. my short treatise on the fast on Easter Eve in the *Beiträge zur Kirchengesch.* etc., Bd. ii. S. 292.

that such an honour should have been accorded in the ecclesiastical province of Arles to another metropolitan than that of Arles itself.¹ The ten canons of Vaison are the following:²—

1. "Gallic bishops, who travel in Gaul, need no special testimonial, as they are all neighbours of each other."

2. "When people who, after undertaking penance, lead a good life in satisfactory penitence, and die unexpectedly without the communion in the field or on a journey, oblations shall be accepted for them, and their funeral and their memory shall be celebrated with ecclesiastical love. For it were wrong if the memory of those were excluded from the saving sacrifice who longed for those mysteries with a believing mind, and who, while they regarded themselves for a considerable time as unworthy of the holy mysteries on account of their sins, and longed to be readmitted to them when they had been purified more, suddenly died without the viaticum of the sacraments, when the priest perhaps had not refused them the *absolutissima reconciliatio*."³ In distinction from the *absolutissima reconciliatio*, the *reconciliatio minor* consisted in reception into the fourth degree of penitence.

3. "Priests and deacons in the country shall shortly before Easter apply for the chrism, not to some favourite bishop, but to their own, and shall bring it away themselves, or at least by a sub-deacon, and by no one of lower rank."

4. "If any one shall refuse to make over the pious bequests of the dead to the Church, he must be treated as an unbeliever."

5. "If any one shall be unable to acquiesce in the judgment of his bishop, he shall have recourse to the Synod."

6. "In accordance with a passage of the (pretended) letter of the Roman Clement to James, no one shall have intercourse with people of whom he knows that they are hostile to the bishop."

7. "Bishops must not come forward as frivolous accusers (of their colleagues before the Synod). If a bishop believes

¹ Cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, etc., t. xv. p. 69. Remi Ceillier, *l.c.* p. 784.

² In Sirmond, *Concil. Gall.* t. i. p. 76 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1787 sq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 451 sqq.; Bruns, *l.c.* p. 127 (with the variations of the incomplete S. Maur collection of *Concil. Gall.* See above, p. 159, note 1).

³ Cf. Frank, *Die Bussdisciplin*, 1867, S. 734 and 912 f.; and Kober, *Kirchenbann* etc., S. 527 f.

(and proposes) that any one (*i.e.* a colleague) shall be excommunicated, and the other bishops make intercession that he shall (only) be reprimanded and otherwise punished, then he shall not further disturb the brother with reference to whom there is question, when punishment and warning are pronounced upon him. If, however, he believes that excommunication is necessary on account of his offences, then he shall formally appear as accuser, for it is reasonable that what is proved (certain) to one (himself) may also be proved to others."

8. "If a bishop is the only one who knows of the offence of another (bishop), he shall not bring anything of the matter forward, so long as he can prove nothing, but shall endeavour to awaken penitence in the offender by private exhortations. If this is unavailing, and he becomes only more defiant, and mixes himself in public communion (as by taking part in the Synod), then, even if the accusing bishop can produce no proof, and he cannot be condemned by those who do not certainly know of his offence, yet he shall be required to withdraw for a time (apparently from the Synod) because a person of distinction has accused him. But so long as nothing is proved, he remains in Church communion with all, except him who knows of his guilt."

I believe I have, in the previous somewhat free translation, rightly explained this most obscure and difficult canon, which was not generally understood. It is in contradiction with c. 5 (132) of the seventeenth Synod of Carthage, of the year 419. See vol. ii. p. 475.

9. "If any one has found a child which has been exposed, he shall, in accordance with the edict of the Emperors (Honorius and Theodosius II.), give notice of it to the Church, and on the following Sunday the minister (probably the sub-deacon) shall announce at the altar that such a child has been found, and that it can be taken away within ten days. During these ten days the finder shall retain it, and shall for this receive his reward from men, or, if he prefers it, from God."

The law of March 19, 412, adduced in this canon, printed in Mansi (t. vi. p. 458), assigns the foundling to the finder as his property, if witnesses declare that it has not been claimed, and the bishop signs this testimony.

10. "If any one, after the passing of this law, demands back a child thus acquired (passed over into the possession of a stranger), and slanders (the finder, as if he had stolen it), he shall be punished by the Church as a murderer."

The child remained the property, the bondsman, of the finder.

SEC. 164. *Second Synod of Arles, A.D. 443 or 452.*

Many learned men, particularly Peter de Marca, Baluzius, Quesnel in his edition of the works of Leo the Great (t. ii. Diss. v.), and Remi Ceillier (t. xiii. p. 786), assign to the year 443 that Synod of Arles which is ordinarily known as *Arclatensis II.*, while that of the year 314 is regarded as the first, and that of 353 is not reckoned, as being Arian. Others, particularly Sirmond, Hardouin, and Mansi, refer it to the year 452; while some (*e.g.* Binius) think it should be fixed almost a hundred years earlier, because it speaks of apostasy from Christianity. The last reason is certainly not sufficient, for even in the middle of the fifth century, especially in the provinces possessed by the barbarians, apostasy might frequently take place. Whether, however, we are to prefer 443 or 452, even the industry and acumen of Tillemont have not been able to decide.¹

The explanation of the last canon of this Synod of Arles, which gives instructions to the metropolitans (in the majority), leaves us to suppose that it was not a mere provincial council, but included bishops from several provinces. Their names have not come down to us; probably, however, S. Hilary of Arles presided, especially as the assembly took place at the capital of his province. It promulgated fifty-six canons, of which many are merely repetitions of ordinances of earlier Synods, particularly of those of Orange and Vaison, of the first of Arles, and of Nicæa.² Their contents are as follow:—

1. "A neophyte must not be ordained a priest or deacon."

¹ *Mémoires*, t. xv. p. 843. Cf. Remi Ceillier, t. xv. p. 601; Walch, *Hist. der Kirchenvers.* S. 294.

² These fifty-six canons are printed in Sirmond, *l.c.* p. 103 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 771 sqq.; Mansi, t. vii. p. 876 sqq.; Bruns, *l.c.* p. 130 sqq. (according to the edition of S. Maur, cf. above, p. 159, note 1).

2. "A married man is not to be made a priest unless his conversion (*i.e* vow of chastity) has preceded."

3. "Under penalty of excommunication, no cleric, from a deacon upwards, shall have a woman in his house, except his grandmother, mother, daughter, niece, or his own wife, but after she too has taken the vow of chastity. The like punishment with himself shall the woman also receive if she will not separate from him."

4. "No deacon, priest, or bishop shall allow a girl to enter his chamber, whether a free woman or a slave."

5. "Without the metropolitan, or his written permission, and (*vel = et*)¹ without their comprovincial bishops no bishop is to be consecrated. The others (comprovincials) shall be requested to give their adhesion in writing. If a controversy arise respecting the election of a bishop, the metropolitan shall agree with the majority."

Compare the more ancient ordinances on the election and consecration of a bishop in vol. i. pp. 195, 381, 385 f.; vol. ii. pp. 72, 73, 130, 307.

6. "If any one is consecrated without the consent of the metropolitan, in accordance with the previous ordinance of the great Synod, he cannot be a bishop."

Cf. the sixth canon of Nicæa, vol. i. p. 388 ff.

7. "Those who mutilate themselves, because otherwise they are unable to resist the flesh, cannot be made clerics."

Cf. vol. i. p. 376 f. and p. 466.

8. "If any one is excommunicated by a bishop, he must not be received by another."

Cf. vol. i. pp. 193 f., 196, 386 f., 462 f., 471; vol. ii. pp. 68, 147 f.

9. "A Novatian must not be received, unless he has shown a spirit of penitence and has condemned his error."

Cf. vol. i. p. 409 f.

10. "In reference to those who have shown themselves weak in persecution, the (eleventh) Nicene canon (which is cited here according to the translation of Rufinus) shall be observed."

11. "Those who have been constrained by tortures to

¹ Cf. Du Cange, *Glossar. s.h.v.*

apostatize, shall spend two years among the *audientes*, and three years among the penitents (third grade)."

Cf. vol. i. p. 205.

12. "If any one dies during his time of penitence, his oblation shall be accepted (*oblatio illius suscipiatur*)."

See above, c. 2 of Vaison, p. 165.

13. "No cleric shall, under penalty of excommunication (here and frequently = *deposition*), leave his church. If, while he is staying elsewhere, he is ordained by the bishop of that place without the consent of his own, this ordination is invalid."

Cf. Kober, *Deposition* etc.

14. "If a cleric lends money on usury, or rents another's property, or for the sake of unclean gain carries on any business, he must be deposed and excommunicated" (*depositus a clero communione alienus fiat*).

15. "A deacon may not sit in the secretarium among the priests; and if a priest is present, he must not administer the body of Christ, under penalty of deposition."

Cf. vol. i. p. 426 f.

16. "The Photinians or Paulinians (adherents of Photinus of Sirmium and Paul of Samosata) must, in accordance with the prescriptions of the Fathers, be rebaptized."

Cf. vol. i. p. 430, vol. ii. p. 302.

17. "The Bonosians (= Antidicomarianites), however, because, like the Arians, they baptize in the name of the Trinity, shall be taken into the Church by merely receiving the chrism and the imposition of hands."

18. "Synods are to be summoned according to the discretion of the Bishop of Arles, in which city (Arles), in the time of S. Marinus (Archbishop of Arles), a council of bishops from all parts of the world, especially from Gaul, was celebrated (namely, the first Synod of Arles in the year 314). Whoever is, through weak health, unable to come himself, shall send a representative."

19. "If any one fails to come, or of his own accord leaves before the termination of the Synod, he will be excluded *a fratrum communione*, and can be taken back into communion only by the next Synod."

On the meaning of excommunication in this case, cf. vol. ii. p. 424, c. 11, and c. 20 of Chalcedon, c. 6 of Tarragona, A.D. 516. Kober, *Kirchenbann* etc., S. 43.

20. "Horse and carriage drivers (*agitatores*) and actors, as long as they continue in that manner of life, are excommunicated."

Cf. canons 4 and 5 of the first Synod of Arles, A.D. 314, vol. i. p. 186 f.

21. "If a female penitent after the death of her husband marries another, or enters into suspicious intercourse with him, she shall be excommunicated, along with her fellow-offender. So with the man who has been a penitent."

The reference here may be either to penitence in the proper sense, or to the vow of asceticism, which was also called *penitentia* (cf. Du Cange, *Glossar.*, and under c. 15 of the Synod of Agde, A.D. 506). One who had undertaken *penitentia* in the latter sense could of course no longer marry; but also during the time of penitence in the ordinary sense, no one was allowed to marry, and those who were married had no sexual intercourse. This enables us to understand also the following canon.

22. "Married persons can be admitted to penitence only with the permission of the other partner."

23. "A bishop must not permit unbelievers in his diocese to light torches or trees in honour of fountains or rocks. If he fails to prevent this, he has made himself guilty of sacrilege. The proprietor of the place, moreover, who permits such in defiance of warning given, shall be excommunicated."

24. "If any one falsely imputes a capital crime to another, he shall be excommunicated to the end of his life, as the great Synod (the first of Arles, canon 14) ordains, unless he has done penance by sufficient satisfaction."

25. "If any one, after taking a monastic vow, apostatizes (from the monastic state), and returns again into the world, he cannot, without penance, be received to communion, and cannot become a cleric."

Canons 26 to 46 inclusive=canons 1 to 26 of the first Synod of Orange. See above, p. 160.

Canons 47 and 48=canons 4 and 5 of Synod of Vaison.
See above, p. 166.

49. "The excommunicated is excluded not only from intercourse and conversation with the clergy, but also from that of the laity, until he reforms."

50. "Those who have public enmity towards each other, must not be present at divine service, until they are reconciled."

51=9 and 10 of the Synod of Vaison in reference to children exposed. See above, p. 167.

52. "If virgins who have devoted themselves to God still marry after their twenty-fifth year, they shall, with those who have married them, be deprived of communion, but shall be admitted to penance when they wish it. Communion consequent upon this penance shall not be administered to them for some time."

53. "If a slave commits suicide, no reproach shall fall upon his master."

54. "If a bishop is to be elected, three candidates shall be named by the comprovincial bishops, with exclusion of all bribery and all ambition, and of these three the clergy and (*vel*) citizens of the city may choose one."

On *vel*=*et*, see p. 168, canon 5.

55. "If a layman, out of love for a religious life, has betaken himself to the bishop of another diocese, this bishop, after having instructed him, shall retain him."

56. "The metropolitans shall violate no ordinance of the great Synod."

In canon 6 the Council of Nicæa is called *magna Synodus*, while in canon 24 this name is given to the first of Arles. In this place, however, it is certainly the present second Synod of Arles which is meant, and it is all Synods like the present which are referred to in canons 18 and 19.

SEC. 165. *Synods at Rome and Besançon, A.D. 444 and 445.*

In the first days of the year 444, or shortly before, a sect of new Manichæans, probably Priscillianists, was discovered in the city of Rome. Pope Leo the Great on this account held,

probably in January 444, a great assembly of bishops, clergy, senators, and other distinguished laymen, in order to expose the indecencies and excesses of this sect. Their own bishop and other leading persons presented a complete confession, and Leo had a minute of the proceedings drawn up, which he sent abroad in all directions. We see this from his sixteenth discourse, and from his seventh letter, which is dated on January 30, 444.¹ The Acts of this Synod have not come down to us.

In the same year, 444, Archbishop Hilary of Arles held a Gallican Synod. It is well known that Hilary was endeavouring to obtain for his see the primacy over the whole of Gaul, and for this purpose made many encroachments upon other provinces. In particular, he claimed the right that all the bishops [of Gaul] should be consecrated by him, and not by their own metropolitans.² An encroachment of another kind is mentioned in the already quoted letter of Pope Leo the Great, and in the *Vita Hilarii* by Honoratus Massiliensis,³ according to which Hilary, at a Gallican Synod, probably at Besançon (*Synodus Vesontionensis*), pronounced the deposition of Celidonius, the bishop of that city, although he belonged to another province, because, while yet a layman, he had married a widow. Of the other members of this Synod only S. Germanus of Auxerre is known to us, who is mentioned by the biographer of Hilary (*l.c.*). Celidonius, however, refused to recognize the sentence of the Synod, and went to Rome in order to seek for protection and assistance from Pope Leo. Hilary followed directly afterwards, in order by his personal presence to secure a fair consideration of the case. Pope Leo thereupon, as it appears, held in the year 445 a Synod at Rome (*Concilium Sacerdotum*), where Hilary was required to bring forward his proofs against Celidonius; but he could not show that the wife of Celidonius had really been a widow, and that to which he appealed did not consist of facts, but of secrets of conscience. Probably he intended to maintain that the

¹ Leonis *Opp.* ed. Baller. t. i. pp. 50 and 623; Mansi, t. vi. p. 459; cf. Baron. *ad ann.* 444, n. 1 sqq.; Pagi, *Crit. in Annales Baron. ad ann.* 444, n. 2; Tillemont, *l.c.* t. xv. 426.

² Cf. *Epist.* 10 of Leo the Great, to the bishops of the province of Vienne, in t. i. p. 632 of Ballerini's edition, and in Mansi, t. v. p. 1243, c. 2.

³ Printed in Mansi, t. vi. p. 461 sq.

woman in question, before she married Celidonius, had privately known another man. The consequence was, that Pope Leo declared the sentence of the Gallic Synod invalid, and restored Celidonius to his bishopric.¹

SEC. 166. *Three Oriental Synods at Ephesus, at Antioch, and in the province of Hierapolis.*

Bishop Bassianus of Ephesus, in the eleventh session of the fourth Œcumenical Synod at Chalcedon, refers to a provincial Council at Ephesus, which must have taken place between the fortieth and fiftieth years of the fifth century. He relates here: "From his youth up he had assisted the poor, and at Ephesus he had, at his own expense, erected a poorhouse, with seventy beds. As he had thereby gained universal love, his bishop, Memnon, had become jealous, and had (in accordance with the saying *promoveatur ut amoveatur*) consecrated him bishop of Evazæ against his will, by the application of physical force to such a degree that blood had flowed. He had, however, never entered that diocese, or accepted that office. After the death of Memnon, his successor, Archbishop Basil, had summoned a provincial Council to Ephesus, and had there acknowledged that violence had been done to Bassianus, and ordained a new bishop for Evazæ."² It is of this provincial Synod that we have now briefly to treat. None of its Acts have come down to us. The further destinies of Bassian, however, particularly how he afterwards himself became Archbishop of Ephesus, and was subsequently deposed, we shall hear in the history of the fourth Œcumenical Council.

In the minutes of the fourteenth session, we find a document which mentions a Synod at Antioch in A.D. 445.³ This Synod was held, in the portico of the summer Secretarium, at Antioch by Archbishop Domnus, the successor of that John who was so well known in the Nestorian controversy. Many

¹ Cf. the above quoted *Epist.* 10 of S. Leo, c. 3; and Tillemont, *Mém.* t. xv. p. 70 and p. 844; and the fifth Dissertation of Quesnel (printed in Ballerini's ed. of the works of Leo), which treats of this very subject.

² Hardouin, t. ii. p. 550; Mansi, t. v. p. 1203, and t. vii. p. 274 sqq.

³ In Hardouin, t. ii. p. 579; Mansi, t. vi. p. 465, and t. vii. p. 315 sqq.; especially p. 326 sqq., where the Acts of this Synod at Antioch are given.

metropolitans and other bishops, altogether twenty-eight, were present. Athanasius, bishop of Perrha, in the province Euphratensis, had several years before been accused by his own clergy, before the Patriarch Domnus of Antioch, on account of various offences, particularly because he had appropriated to himself some silver pillars which belonged to the Church. Domnus commissioned the metropolitan of Athanasius, Archbishop Panolbius of Hierapolis (the successor of the Nestorian Alexander), to inquire into the matter; but instead of appearing for trial, Athanasius resigned his bishopric. Because, however, Panolbius did not immediately ordain a new bishop for Perrha, Athanasius in a short time, of his own accord, resumed his see, and brought it about that, at the intercession of S. Cyril and of Proclus of Constantinople, the Emperor commissioned the Patriarch Domnus himself to examine the matter in dispute. This was done at the Synod of Antioch, A.D. 445. Athanasius, however, did not appear, and was deposed. At the same time the Synod commanded that a new bishop should be ordained for Perrha. This command was obeyed a short time afterwards by a Syrian Synod in the province of Hierapolis (in Syria, not in Phrygia, as Walch erroneously suggests¹), and Sabinian, hitherto abbot of a monastery, was elected, as we also learn from the Acts of the fourteenth session of Chalcedon. It is indeed not expressly spoken of there as a Synod, but it is said that the Metropolitan of Hierapolis *and* his com-provincial bishops had appointed Sabinian bishop of Perrha.² This implies a provincial Synod. It is generally assumed that it took place in Hierapolis itself; but Sabinian says (*l.c.*) that the metropolitan and the com-provincial bishops had come to him, that is, into his monastery, and thus the electing Synod was certainly held in the city in which Sabinian lived as a monk—perhaps in Perrha itself. In the history of the Council of Chalcedon we shall again meet with the three Synods mentioned in this section.

¹ *Hist. der Kirchenvers.* S. 296.

² Mansi, t. vii. p. 317; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 573, in the letter of Sabinian to the Emperors.

SEC. 167. *Spanish Synods, on account of the Priscillianists, in the years 446, 447.*

The sending forth of the Acts of the above-named Roman Council (p. 171) caused fresh attention to be directed to the Priscillianists in Spain also, which led to the holding of several Synods on their account, particularly that at Astorga (*Astorica*), in the north-west of Spain, A.D. 446, which is mentioned only by Idacius in his *Chronicle*, p. 26.¹ Nothing further is known of it, and the suggestions which have been made are uncertain.² The letter of Bishop Turibius of Astorga to Pope Leo the Great³ allows us to suppose that he had held the Synod simply because of his zeal to uncloak the Priscillianists. Pope Leo, however, in his answer, stirred up Turibius to new activity,⁴ and thus led to the holding of two other larger Spanish Synods, of which the one was held probably at Toledo, A.D. 447, the other a little later in the province of Galicia, in *municipio Celenensi*.⁵ Pope Leo had desired that an *Œcumenical* Spanish Synod should be held, but the political relations made this impossible, as Spain was under various rulers, and these ordered that instead of a national Synod, two or three particular Synods should be held.

At the first (of Toledo) there were present the bishops of *Hispania Tarraconensis* and *Carthaginensis*, of Lusitania, and Bætica, and a creed and eighteen anathematisms are ascribed to this Synod.⁶ The documents relating to it are given in the collections after the Acts of the Synod of Toledo of the year 400.⁷ In the creed in question for the first time the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity was expressed, and it was

¹ In Mansi, t. vi. p. 491.

² Cf. Mansi, t. v. p. 489 sqq.; Florez, *España Sagrada*, t. vi. p. 121; Bower, *Gesch. der Päpste* [*History of the Popes*, originally written in English] under Pope Leo the Great.

³ Printed after the 15th letter of Leo in Ballerini, t. i. p. 711 sqq., in Mansi, t. v. p. 1302 sqq.

⁴ S. Leonis M. *Ep.* 15 in Mansi, t. v. p. 1288 sqq.

⁵ Mansi, t. vi. p. 491.

⁶ Thus by Baronius, *ad ann.* 447, n. 16; Pagi, *Critica*, *ad ann.* 405, n. 16 and 17; and by Mandernach in his *Gesch. des Priscillianismus*, Trier 1851, S. 64 ff.; Lübker, *De hæresi Priscill.* 1840, p. 107.

⁷ In Mansi, t. iii. p. 1002 sqq.; Hardouin, t. i. p. 993 sqq.

said of the Holy Ghost *a patre FILIOQUE procedens*:¹ then the doctrine of the two natures in the one person of Christ was sharply defined, although without the exactness of Chalcedon,² and then it proceeded: "And the body of Christ is no imaginary one, no phantom, but a real and true one (*solidum atque verum*): He (*hunc* = Christ) felt hunger, and thirst, and pain, and wept, and bore all bodily trials, was at last crucified by the Jews, on the third day rose again, afterwards conversed with His disciples, and on the fortieth day after His resurrection ascended into heaven. This Son of man is also called Son of God; and Him who is Son of God, the Lord, we call Son of man. We believe that a resurrection of human flesh will take place, and we teach that the human soul is not a divine substance or like to God, but a creature made by the divine will."

To this are added the following eighteen anathematisms in opposition to the errors of the Priscillianists:—

1. "If any one says or believes that this world and its constitution is not created by Almighty God, let him be anathema."

2. "If any one says or believes that the Father is the same as the Son and the Paraclete, let him be anathema."

3. "If any one says or believes that the Son of God is the same as the Father and the Paraclete, let him be anathema."

4. "If any one says or believes that the Paraclete is the Father or the Son, let him be anathema."

5. "If any one says or believes that the Son of God has assumed flesh only, and not a soul also, let him be anathema."

6. "If any one says or believes that Christ is *innascibilis*, let him be anathema."³

¹ Pope Leo, in his letter to Turibius, c. i., in which he sets forth the anti-trinitarian doctrine of the Priscillianists, employed this expression in reference to the Holy Spirit: *Qui de utroque processit*, Mansi, t. v. p. 1290. The Spaniards followed these words of Leo when they used the *filioque*. For the rest, the creed was recited at Rome so late as the ninth century without the *filioque*. See Hergenröther in the *Tüb. theol. Quartalschrift*, 1858, S. 606, 614.

² The Monophysitism which is here opposed is that of the Priscillianists.

³ The Priscillianists denied the personal distinction in the Trinity, in the same way as the Sabellians. The Son was therefore, in their view, only a *Power of God*, but not eternally begotten of the Father. Cf. Walch, *Ketzers-historie*, Bd. iii. S. 464 f.; and Mandernach, *l.c.*, S. 8 and 69. Perhaps it should

7. "If any one says or believes that the Godhead of Christ is susceptible of change or of suffering, let him be anathema."

8. "If any one says or believes that the God of the old covenant is another than that of the Gospels, let him be anathema."

9. "If any one says or believes that the world is made by another God than by Him of whom it is written: In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, let him be anathema."

10. "If any one says or believes that men's bodies will not arise after death, let him be anathema."

11. "If any one says or believes that the human soul is a part of God, or of the substance of God, let him be anathema."

12. "If any one says or believes that, besides the Scriptures which the Catholic Church receives, there are others which are to be regarded as authoritative (*in auctoritate habendas*), or to be revered, let him be anathema."

13. "If any one says or believes that there is only one nature of the Godhead and manhood in Christ, let him be anathema."¹

14. "If any one says or believes that there is anything which can extend beyond the divine Trinity, let him be anathema."

15. "If any one thinks that credit should be given to astrology or *Mathesis*, let him be anathema."

16. "If any one says that marriages which are permitted by the divine law are abominable (*excerabilia*), let him be anathema."

17. "If any one says that we should not merely abstain from the flesh of birds and beasts for the sake of chastening the body, but that we should abominate them (*execrandas esse carnes*), let him be anathema."

18. "Whoever follows in these heresies of the sect of Priscillian, or confesses them, or in holy baptism does anything in opposition to the see of Peter,² let him be anathema."

also be said: The Son (the Power of God) could not in fact be born as pure spirit, but only in appearance (*docetically*).

¹ Cf. above, p. 176.

² In opposition to the universal law of the Church, the Priscillianists omitted, in the baptismal formula, the conjunctions (*et . . . et*), so that Father, Son, and Spirit appeared identical. Cf. Mandernach, l.c. S. 17.

SEC. 168. *Synods in Gaul, in Britain, and in Rome,*
A.D. 447.

A French and an English Synod with reference to Pelagianism are generally assigned to the years 446, 447. On account of the wide spread of the Pelagians in England, the British bishops, a short time before the invasion of Britain by the Anglo-Saxons, summoned the French bishops to their assistance. The latter held a Synod, but where is unknown, and then sent two of their number, S. Germanus of Auxerre, and S. Lupus of Troyes, to England. These held a Synod here also, probably at St. Albans (Verulam), at which Pelagius and his disciple Agricola were subjected to anathema, and the Pelagians declared themselves defeated. This is asserted by the ancient biographer of S. Germanus, the priest Constantius,¹ by Prosper in his *Chronicle*, *ad ann.* 429, and by the Venerable Bede.² But Pagi, even in his time, suggested doubts as to the chronology, and assigned both the Synods to the year 429.³ And the same opinion is maintained by Greith (Bishop of S. Gallen) in his history of the ancient Irish Church.⁴

A Roman Synod of the year 447, under Pope Leo the Great, on the complaints of some Sicilian bishops, issued good decrees in order to make the spending of the property of the Church by careless bishops impossible.⁵

SEC. 169. *Synod at Antioch*, A.D. 447 or 448. *Two Assemblies at Berytus and Tyre.*

After the death of Bishop Rabulas, as we saw above, p. 155, his chief opponent, Ibas, the well-known admirer of Theodore of Mopsuestia, became his successor in the see of Edessa. After some time, four clerics of the city, Samuel, Cyrus, Maras, and Eulogius, brought forward complaints against the new

¹ In his *Vita S. Germani*, lib. i. c. 19.

² In his *Hist. eccl. gentis Anglorum*, i. 17; Mansi, t. vi. p. 487 sqq.

³ Pagi, *ad ann.* 429, n. 2 sqq. Cf. Lingard, *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, chap. i.

⁴ *Gesch. der Altirischen Kirche*, Freib. 1867, S. 75 f.

⁵ Leonis Mag. *Epist.* 17 *ad universos episcopos per Siciliam*, in Baller. t. i. p. 227 sqq.; in Mansi, t. v. p. 1314; cf. t. vi. p. 493.

bishop, asserting that he was endeavouring to circulate the writings of Theodore, and thereby erroneous doctrines, and also to make the division again wider between the Orientals and the Alexandrians. They presented these accusations to Archbishop Domnus of Antioch, and he relieved them at once, as Easter was near, from the excommunication which Ibas had pronounced upon them; the full decision, however, was reserved for a great Synod, which he intended to hold at Antioch after Easter 447 or 448. He forbade the four accusers, under threats of severe punishments, to remove from Antioch before the matter was brought on for consideration. At the numerously attended Synod, which now actually took place after Easter,¹ the accusations against Ibas were read; but as two of the accusers, Samuel and Cyrus, were no longer present, the matter was no further proceeded with, and these two men were excommunicated.² They had already departed for Constantinople, in order to forward the case more effectually, and thither they were followed by the two other accusers, with their patron, Bishop Uranius of Himeria, a friend of Eutyches. They now brought their complaints before the Emperor, Theodosius II., and Flavian, the new Patriarch of Constantinople.

The Archimandrite Eutyches, the extreme opponent of Nestorius, and therefore also of Theodore of Mopsuestia and of Ibas, supported them; and Archbishop Flavian, too, seems not to have been unfavourable to them, and to have quashed the sentence of the Synod of Antioch, although his doing so was contrary to the canons of the Church.³ They specially represented to the Emperor and the Patriarch that Domnus of Antioch was a friend of Ibas, and therefore not an impartial judge, and succeeded in getting the Emperor to issue a commission to the before-named Bishop Uranius and the two bishops, Photius of Tyre and Eustathius of Berytus, to examine the matter afresh, and to add to this commission the tribune

¹ The names of the bishops present are given in Hardouin, t. ii. p. 515; Mansi, t. vii. p. 218. Cf. the following note.

² We find this in the Acts of the tenth session of Chalcedon, in Hardouin, t. ii. p. 511 sqq.; Mansi, t. vii. p. 214 sqq.

³ Cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. xv. p. 473.

and notary Damascius.¹ So Archbishop Flavian strengthened the commission by his deacon Eulogius. The accusers and the accused were required to appear before the commission; and the former brought forward accusations not only against Ibas, but against his cousin, the young Bishop Daniel of Carraë, and against John, Bishop of Theodosiople. They accused Ibas not only of heretical expressions and views, but also of other faults, particularly of squandering the property of the Church, and of nepotism, since he had ordained as bishop the unworthy and dissolute son of his brother, the Daniel just mentioned, although he was never at home, but was always staying at Edessa from love to a married woman of that city, thus causing great scandal, while he enriched his mistress from the property of the Church.² The commission held two sittings (not proper Synods), one at Tyre, the other at Berytus. The question as to which of the two was the earlier can no longer be answered with absolute certainty. According to the very improbable chronological statements in the documents relating to them,³ the session at Tyre was held in February, that at Berytus on the 1st of September in the same year (448 or 449). But, to begin with, the date "September 1" is decidedly incorrect, since the clergy of Edessa, in the memorial which they addressed to the meeting at Berytus in favour of Ibas, express the wish that he may be allowed to return home *before the next Easter*.⁴ Besides, the Acts of Tyre, so to speak, naturally presuppose those of Berytus, since only in the latter are the accusations brought forward; while in Tyre the commissioners abandoned their position as *judges* in the proper sense of the word, and instead proposed to act as *peacemakers*, and actually were so. The Acts on the proceedings at Berytus, therefore, are inconclusive, and lead to no result,⁵ and for this reason, that the peacemaking at Tyre was the *second* Act of

¹ The decree on the subject, dd. vi. Kal. Novb., without mention of the year, is in Hardouin, t. ii. p. 510; Mansi, t. vii. p. 210.

² In Hardouin, t. ii. p. 518 sq.; Mansi, t. vii. p. 221 sqq. Cf. Walch, *Ketzergesch.* Bd. vi. S. 75 ff.

³ In the ninth and tenth sessions of Chalcedon, in Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 503 and 511; in Mansi, t. vii. pp. 198 sqq. and 211 sqq.

⁴ Hardouin, t. ii. p. 534; Mansi, t. vii. p. 251; Pagi, *Crit. ad ann.* 448, n. 10.

⁵ In Hardouin, t. ii. p. 538; Mansi, t. vii. p. 255.

the whole proceedings, and a continuation of the sitting at Berytus. This was noted already by Tillemont and Walch, who altered the date of the meeting at Berytus from *Kal. Septbr.* to *Kal. Februarias*.¹ On the other hand, Pagi, Noris, Baronius, and Mansi place the meeting at Tyre *before* that at Berytus,² and think that, after the inhabitants of Tyre had been greatly offended by an insolent speech of Ibas concerning Christ (that He had only *become* God), it had been thought well to remove the meeting to Berytus.

As far as I can judge, absolute certainty is no longer obtainable on this point, but the evidence favours the priority of the meeting at Berytus. Besides what has already been mentioned, the following should be considered: At Berytus, Bishop Uranius, the patron of the accusers, mentioned that he had already been present at the examination of this question at Constantinople and at Antioch. As he was also present at Tyre, if the meeting there had been past, he would certainly have said: "I was present at Constantinople, Antioch, and Tyre." It is also impossible to decide whether the meetings at Berytus and Tyre took place in the year 448 or in 449. The expression of the Acts: *Post consulatum Flavii Zenonis et Postumiani*,³ is taken by some of the learned as identical with *sub consulatu* etc., and in that case the year 448 would be indicated. Others, however, interpret the word *post* quite strictly, and decide, therefore, for the year 449.⁴ On the *contents* and *details* of the proceedings at Berytus and Tyre, we need not speak more fully until we come to consider the history of the ninth and tenth sessions of Chalcedon.

¹ Tillemont, t. xv. p. 474 sq. and p. 897 sq.; Walch, *Ketzergesch.* Bd. vi. S. 69, and *Hist. der Kirchewers.* S. 299. In opposition to this hypothesis, reference might be made to the statements of the indictments in the Acts of Tyrus and Berytus, since that of Tyre is noted as *Indict. i.*, that of Berytus as *Indict. ii.* But Tillemont has remarked (*l.c.*) that such statements of indictments are often inaccurate and later additions. He is mistaken, however, when he thinks that the 10th of the month Peritius, according to the Syrian reckoning, is not the 25th of February, as is stated in the Acts of Tyre. Cf. Ideler, *Lehrb. der Chronologie*, S. 182.

² Mansi, t. vi. pp. 499-502; Pagi, *ad ann.* 548, n. 9.

³ In Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 503 and 511; Mansi, t. vii. pp. 198 and 211.

⁴ So Noris, Tillemont, Pagi, and Walch. Baronius, on the contrary, and Mansi (vi. p. 501) are for the year 448.

CHAPTER II.

EUTYCHES AND THE SYNOD AT CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 448.

SEC. 170. *The Monophysites begin the Conflict. Bishops Irenæus and Theodoret are persecuted.*

WHEN the Nestorian heresy began to separate too widely the two natures in Christ, the Godhead and the manhood, its false opponent, Monophysitism, was already in existence, namely, that which made the two natures unite or coalesce into one.¹ This was at the time called Apollinarianism; and as certainly as S. Cyril did not deserve the reproach of Apollinarianism, so is it certain, on the other side, that not only the orthodox, but also those who held Monophysite opinions, took their place under his banner on the supposition that they might venture to regard him as their advocate. His anathematisms, especially the third, seemed to justify this supposition. But Cyril not only opposed Nestorianism, but also avoided the rock that lay over against it, and expressed this with remarkable clearness at the establishment of peace in the Church with the Orientals (see above, pp. 128, 131 ff.). From that time no one could any longer be in doubt as to his holding the orthodox Diophysitism. At the same time he united with this that wise moderation which required only the triumph of the dogma, but not the overthrow of its previous opponents. For this reason it was only necessary that Nestorius alone should be anathematized, and that the anathema on him should be universally recognized—all other

¹ According to Theodoret, *Epist.* 83 *ad Dioscur.*, some taught "that the divine nature was often changed into the human, that the human was changed into the divine." This latter is Eutychianism proper. An earlier form of the error, on the contrary, as Katerkamp remarks (*Kirchengesch.* Bd. iii. S. 162), was taught by several Apollinarians of that time, who took in a quite literal sense the sentence, "the Word was made flesh."

opponents were forgiven.¹ For this reason, however, as we saw before, p. 139, he was met with the reproach of treachery by many of his previous adherents; and although some of them, like Isidore of Pelusium, made the charge only from a misunderstanding, the others did so on intelligible grounds from their Monophysite point of view. As we also saw, Cyril defended himself with perfect clearness; but they persisted in requiring that anathema should be pronounced on all who spoke of *two* natures in Christ after the union of the Godhead and the manhood. So it was with Acacius of Melitene, Succensus of Diocæsarea, and others. That even in Egypt there were not a few of Monophysite opinions is asserted by Isidore of Pelusium,² and this was shown, too, by the course of history. It was chiefly in the monasteries that this error had found admission; and many monks who had formerly exhibited so great zeal against Nestorius, now showed that they had themselves fallen into the opposite error. This was particularly the case with Eutyches, the Archimandrite of Constantinople, whom we have frequently met with as the active assistant of Cyril, and whom we now see at the head of the new heretics.

It was a great misfortune that Cyril, who might have suppressed this new error by his predominating influence, died in the year 444, and had as his successor Dioscurus, who had been his archdeacon, a man who up to this time had enjoyed a good reputation, and had also accompanied his bishop to the Synod of Ephesus,³ but now was ever more visibly leaning to Monophysitism, and soon became the patron and the support of the new heretics in all dioceses and provinces. With this he united a bitter enmity to the memory of Cyril, accused him of having exhausted the treasury of the Church of Alexandria in the struggle against Nestorius, and therefore confiscated his not inconsiderable effects (for Cyril belonged to a very distinguished and wealthy family), procuring with the proceeds cheaper bread for the poor, and thereby gaining popularity for

¹ Katerkamp (Bd. iii. S. 162) says: "Cyril did not persist in requiring that the Orientals should anathematize Nestorius." This is incorrect. See above, p. 132.

² Lib. i. Epist. 419, p. 108, and 496, p. 124.

³ Cf. Tillemont, t. xv. in the Dissertation on S. Leo, art. ix. p. 434; and t. xiv. in art. cli. on S. Cyril.

himself; whilst at the same time he expelled some of Cyril's relations by violence from among the clergy of Alexandria, and plundered their benefices. We do not doubt that Dioscurus, with his Monophysite views, was in real earnest; but at the same time he is liable to the suspicion of having favoured this tendency in order that he might find a means of again elevating the see of Alexandria above that of Constantinople, and, still more, above the other Oriental patriarchates, in which he actually succeeded at the so-called Robber-Synod.

Trusting to the protection of such a man, who to his great position united still greater violence of action, the Monophysites ventured in various places to persecute orthodox bishops and priests as heretical, and, when possible, to remove them from their offices. The first striking case of this kind was their attack on Irenæus, since the year 444 Metropolitan of Tyre in Phœnicia, who, when an imperial Count, at the time of the Council of Ephesus, had certainly belonged to the patrons of Nestorius, and for that reason had been exiled by the Emperor Theodosius II. in the year 435,¹ but had afterwards separated from Nestorius and joined the union of Cyril. His opponents brought against him the reproach of having been twice married when he was a layman; but Theodoret, who defended him (*Epist.* 110), speaks of his numerous virtues, of his great zeal, of his love to the poor, and his undoubted orthodoxy; and remarks that in former times, also, some who had been married twice had been ordained on account of other excellences of character. He specially adduces several cases of this kind, and adds, that the ordination of Irenæus had been approved of by the blessed Proclus, Archbishop of Constantinople, who had enjoyed so great distinction. Besides the opposition which Theodoret generally led against the rising sect of Monophysites, he had a special reason for a zealous defence of Irenæus, since he was certainly himself present at his consecration, and took part in it; indeed, Baronius and others have inferred, from the wording of his 110th letter, that he was himself the consecrator. Tillemont² remarks, however, that a simple bishop of the

¹ Assemani, *Biblioth. juris orient.* t. i. p. 467 sq.

² T. xv. p. 871, note 5 on the art. "Theodoret," n. xxiv.

province of Euphratesia would hardly have been chosen to consecrate the first metropolitan of Phœnicia, that this honour belonged rather to the Archbishop of Antioch, and that, besides, the *Synodicon* expressly says that Domnus of Antioch ordained Irenæus. With this, however, the expression of Theodoret is quite easily reconciled, if we only regard the words: *ἔχειροτόνησα τὸν . . . Εἰρηναῖον κ.τ.λ.*, as spoken by Domnus, to whom he is writing. Domnus of Antioch, he thinks, should, in the manner which he proposes to him, make declaration to the Emperor in regard to Irenæus. The intercession of Theodoret was, however, of no avail. The Emperor Theodosius II. deposed Irenæus, and gave order that he should be expelled from the Church of Tyre, and live in his native country, without clerical title or dress, as a mere private man in all retirement. This happened in the year 448.¹

It was not long before Theodoret was forced even to defend himself, and now Dioscurus came forward publicly as the protector of the Monophysites. Invited by his patriarch, Domnus, Theodoret had on several occasions spent some weeks in Antioch, and had also preached there. In one of his discourses some persons professed to discover Nestorianism, and communicated this to the Patriarch Dioscurus of Alexandria, although neither they nor Theodoret were subject to his jurisdiction. Dioscurus received the charge, and wrote on the subject to Domnus of Antioch. Theodoret, being informed of this by Domnus, defended himself most brilliantly in a letter to Dioscurus, which is still extant (*Ep.* 83), and there laid down a clear statement of orthodoxy. In spite of this, Dioscurus pronounced an anathema upon him, and sent emissaries to the court in order to aggravate the persecution of Theodoret, which had already begun.² An imperial decree then ordered that Theodoret should immediately return to his diocese and not again leave it, without, however, accusing him of the heresy;³

¹ The imperial decree is given by Mansi, t. v. p. 417, and Hardouin, t. i. p. 1719. It has no date; but it is clear from the governor's appended letter of publication, that it was made known April 18, 448.

² Theodoret, *Epist.* 85 *ad Basil.* and *Epist.* 86 *ad Flavian.*

³ Theodoret, *Epist.* 79 *ad Anatol.*, *Epist.* 80 *ad Eutychium*, *Epist.* 81 *ad Nomum*, *Epist.* 82 *ad Euseb. episc. Apam.*

but a second edict went still farther, and forbade Theodoret to appear at the Synod, which was subsequently to be assembled (the Robber-Synod), unless he were expressly summoned.¹ Pope Leo the Great, in his thirty-first letter to the Empress Pulcheria, says that God has perhaps allowed the appearance of Eutyches for this reason, *ut quales intra ecclesiam laterent possent agnosci*;² and in fact the Monophysites, up to this time, with great cunning, followed the practice of accusing bishops who were perfectly orthodox, and even the whole Eastern episcopate, of Nestorianism, under the pretext of orthodox zeal.³ This mask was now to be torn from them, and first from one of their most distinguished men, the Archimandrite Eutyches, from whom the whole controversy received the name of *Eutychian*.

SEC. 171. *Eutyches and his Accusers.*

Eutyches, who, according to his opponents, had previously borne the name of *Atyches* (*i.e.* the *unlucky*), had become a monk in early youth, and thus was able to say of himself in the year 448 that he had been for seventy years consecrated to the life of continence.⁴ In the Acts of the fourth session at Chalcedon, a certain Abbot Maximus, otherwise unknown, is mentioned as his teacher (*διδάσκαλος*);⁵ it is, however, doubtful whether it is the education of Eutyches, as a monk or as a heretic which is attributed to him. What is certain is, that Eutyches was at the same time monk and priest, and that he had been for nearly thirty years the archimandrite (*μάνδρα* = monastery) of a convent outside the walls of Constantinople, which numbered no fewer than three hundred monks.⁶ When the Nestorian heresy broke out, he placed himself with great zeal on the side of the opponents of that error, and therefore was able to boast that he had contended

¹ In Mansi, t. vi. p. 589; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 71.

² Leonis *Opp.* ed. Baller. t. i. p. 856.

³ Theodoret, *Ep.* 95 *ad Antiochum prefect.*, and *Ep.* 101 *ad Celerinam*.

⁴ Cf. his letters to Pope Leo the Great, in Mansi, t. v. p. 1015, c. 222 of the *Synodicon*.

⁵ Mansi, t. vii. p. 62; Hardouin, t. i. p. 422.

⁶ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 651, 639, 863; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 110, 103, 234.

for the faith with the Synod of Ephesus.¹ He did not mean by this that he had been *personally* present at Ephesus (he must not be confounded with the deacon Eutyches who attended upon Cyril at that Synod), but he directs attention to the fact that he had contributed greatly at the imperial court to the overthrow of Nestorianism. In particular, he had probably taken part in the procession which had been set on foot, as we have heard, by Dalmatius, the archimandrite of another convent, in order to bring the Emperor tidings of the oppression of the orthodox party at Ephesus. Cyril's arch-deacon, Epiphanius, makes mention of him in connection with the same Dalmatius, when he urgently entreats the two archimandrites to adjure the Emperor and the high officers of court in reference to Nestorius, and to support the cause of Cyril (p. 137). The latter prized him so highly that he transmitted to him a special copy of the Acts of Ephesus.² The most influential patron of Eutyches, however, was the then all-powerful imperial minister Chrysaphius, a eunuch, at whose baptism he had stood sponsor.³ He endeavoured also to gain over Pope Leo the Great to his side, writing a letter to him at the beginning of the year 448, in which he complained that Nestorians were still in existence. From his point of view the orthodox necessarily appeared so to him, and Pope Leo seems to have had a suspicion of this, and therefore answered him very cautiously (June 1, 448), praising his zeal, indeed, but adding that he could not intervene until he had obtained more exact information respecting the accused.⁴ In a subsequent letter, however (June 13, 449), Leo says expressly that Eutyches had endeavoured to wound the good name of the orthodox by the reproach of Nestorianism.⁵ We may assume that Eutyches thought that, by these accusations, and also by

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 627, 856; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 95, 229.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 631; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 98.

³ *Liberati Breviar.* c. xi. in Galland. *Biblioth. PP.* t. xii. p. 138.

⁴ *Leonis Epist.* xx. in Ballerini, t. i. p. 737; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 1; Mansi, t. v. p. 1323. The complete letters of Leo are also given in Mansi, t. v. and vi., and in accordance with the ed. of Ballerini. Hardouin has only some of Leo's letters, and these from the editions before that of Quesnel.

⁵ *Epist.* xxxv. in Baller. l.c. p. 877; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 11.

the obstinate retention of his own views, he was certainly defending the orthodox dogma, and that every doctrine which was less rigidly opposed to Nestorianism than his own had a Nestorian tendency. He could not grasp the strong opposition which existed between the orthodox and the Nestorian Diophysitism, and threw out the charge of heresy against every one who spoke of two natures. It was on account of this spiritual narrowness that Leo the Great repeatedly spoke of him as *imprudens* and *nimis imperitus* (e.g. *Epist.* xxviii. c. 1, and *Epist.* xxxv. c. 1), and said of him that his error was *de imperitia magis quam de versutia natus* (*Epist.* xxx. c. 1). Quite as striking were the expressions respecting him of the famous Bishop Alcimus Avitus of Vienne, a younger contemporary of Eutyches, who said: *Nihil existit clare eruditionis in viro*;¹ and very nearly to the same effect was the judgment of the learned Petavius.²

In former days it was thought that Eusebius, bishop of Dorylæum, was the first who, in 448, came forward in opposition to Eutyches; but we learn from Bishop Facundus of Hermione, in his work, *Pro defensione trium capitulorum*,³ that before this Bishop Domnus of Antioch had publicly accused Eutyches of Apollinarianism, and had given information of this to the Emperor Theodosius II. At what time this was done we cannot certainly ascertain. Tillemont and the Ballerini think it was in the beginning of the year 448.⁴ Facundus also gives us the letter of Domnus to the Emperor; but we do not derive from it any true insight into the principles of Eutyches, for what Domnus specially brings forward, that "he had accused Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia of error," might be said not merely of a Monophysite, but of a thoroughly orthodox theologian, as the controversy of the three chapters shows. Whether the complaint of Domnus against Eutyches had any effect is nowhere said. On the contrary, however, the accusation which

¹ *Epist.* ii. in Sirmondi *Opp.* t. ii. p. 8.

² *Dogmat. theol.* lib. i. *De Incarnat.* c. 14, § 4, t. iv. p. 30.

³ Lib. viii. c. 5, and lib. xii. c. 5, in Galland. *Biblioth. PP.* t. xi. pp. 751 and 806.

⁴ Tillemont, t. xv. p. 493, and Baller. ed. *Opp. S. Leonis*, t. ii. p. 448, in the notes.

Eusebius of Dorylæum brought against him at Constantinople in November 448 had the most serious consequences. Flavian was then Archbishop of Constantinople, having succeeded in the year 447, after the death of the former patriarch, Proclus. As Theophanes relates, the powerful minister Chrysaphius was from the beginning averse to this new bishop; and, besides, Flavian lost the favour of the Emperor immediately, because, instead of the accustomed golden *eulogiæ*,¹ he had, on his entrance upon his office, presented to him only consecrated loaves—that is, the *eulogiæ* of the ancient Church.² The consequences of this disfavour showed themselves.

SEC. 172. *Synod at Constantinople, A.D. 448.*

Some misunderstandings, respecting which we have no minute information, between Florentin, Metropolitan of Sardes, and his two suffragans John and Cassian, decided Archbishop Flavian of Constantinople to assemble the bishops then present in the capital to a so-called *σύνδος ἐνδημοῦσα*, holy and great, as the Acts express it, in the episcopal Secretarium, on the 8th of November 448.³ The matter was arranged in the first session, as it would appear, with all despatch. Afterwards, one of the bishops present, Eusebius of Dorylæum in Phrygia, handed in a complaint in writing against Eutyches, and prayed that it might be read. This is the same Eusebius who, almost twenty years before, when he was still a layman, was among the first of those who perceived and opposed the error of Nestorius (see above, p. 14), so that the bishops at the Synod of Chalcedon said of him:

¹ [See art. "Eulogiæ" in *Dict. of Christian Antiq.*]

² Theophan. *Chronographia ad ann.* 5940, t. i. p. 150, ed. Classen, in the Bonn collection of the Byzantines.

³ The names of those present are given in the Acts of the seventh session. These Acts, however, were embodied first in the Acts of the Robber-Synod, and then, along with these, in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon. Mansi, t. vi. p. 649 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 109 sqq. A translation of them (in extract) is given by Fuchs in his *Biblioth. der Kirchenvers.* Bd. iv. S. 361 ff.

Eusebius Nestorium deposuit;¹ and now he was to make the first serious attack on the opposite extreme.

Archbishop Flavian now had his memorial read. It begins with the complaint that Eutyches accused orthodox teachers, even Eusebius of Dorylæum himself, of Nestorianism, and then asks that the Synod will summon him before it, and require an answer to these accusations. He (Eusebius) was ready to prove that Eutyches had no right to the name of Catholic, and was far from the true faith.² Flavian remarked upon this that this accusation against the venerable priest and archimandrite caused him astonishment, and Eusebius should first have an interview and a discussion with him on matters of faith privately. If he then showed himself to be a heretic, the Synod might summon him before it.³ Eusebius replied that he had formerly been a friend of Eutyches, and had spoken with him privately, and warned him not merely once or twice, as several who were present could testify. Eutyches, however, had remained obstinate, and therefore he adjured the Synod to let him appear, so that, being convinced of his error, he might at last abandon it, for many had already been scandalized by him. Flavian wished that Eusebius would go to Eutyches once more, and make another attempt with him; as, however, he utterly refused to do so, the Synod decided to send the priest John and the deacon Andrew as deputies to Eutyches, so that they might read to him the accusations which had been handed in, and invite him to attend before the Synod. The first session then closed.

The second took place four days later, on the 12th of November. Eusebius of Dorylæum renewed his complaint, with the remark that Eutyches by conversations and discussions had misled many others to adopt his error. At his suggestion some earlier documents were now read, as

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 674; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 126.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 651 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 110 sq.

³ An erratum in Mansi, *l.c.* p. 654, may here easily produce great perplexity. According to the reference given there *ad marginem*, the whole from *Et magnus Athanasius* was spoken at Chalcedon, while it really belongs to the Synod of Constantinople. The right reading is *Constantinopoli acta* instead of *Chalcedone acta*. The latter words must be put back several lines to *Sancta Synodus dixit*. Similar errors often occur in Mansi's book.

examples of the orthodox faith—namely, (a) the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius (see above, p. 4 f.) ; (b) the approval of this letter given by the Synod of Ephesus (p. 47) ; and (c) the celebrated letter which Cyril had addressed to John of Antioch after the restoration of peace (p. 137). On the proposition of Eusebius, Flavian now required that every one should assent to these declarations of the faith, as explaining the true sense of the Nicene Creed. These contained that which they who were there present had always believed, and still believed, namely, “that Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is true God and true man, of a reasonable soul and a body subsisting, begotten of the Father before all time, without beginning, according to the Godhead, but in the last times, for us men and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, according to the manhood ; of one substance with the Father according to the Godhead, and of one substance with His mother, according to the manhood. We confess that Christ after the Incarnation consists of two natures (*ἐκ δύο φύσεων*) in one Hypostasis, and in one Person ; one Christ, one Son, one Lord. Whoever asserts otherwise, we exclude from the clergy and the Church. And every one of those present shall set down his view and his faith in the Acts.”¹ They did so, some in longer, some in shorter forms, and therein expressed their faith in the duality of the natures in the one Hypostasis.² On the proposition of Eusebius of Dorylæum, the Acts were sent to those who were absent through sickness in their residences, that they also might be able to declare and to subscribe.³

In the third session, on the 15th of November, the two clerics commissioned by the Synod to Eutyches gave an account of their mission. First, the priest John told them that Eutyches had utterly refused to comply with their command to appear before the Synod, and that he had explained that it was his rule, that from the beginning (of his monastic life)

¹ Hardouin, t. ii. p. 127 ; Mansi, t. vi. p. 679.

² Instead of *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*, some said, in the same sense, *ἐν δύο φύσεσι*. Mansi, t. vi. p. 695 ; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 731. The latter was probably brought forward in the creed at Chalcedon as the more accurate expression.

³ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 657-698 ; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 114-139.

he had resolved never to leave the convent and go to any place whatever; that he would rather remain in it as in the grave. The Synod should, however, know that Eusebius of Dorylæum had long been his enemy, and had slandered him only out of malice, for he was ready to affirm and subscribe the declarations of the holy Fathers of Nicæa and of Ephesus. If these, however, had erred at all in any expressions, he found no fault with this, and did not even believe it, but rather searched in the Holy Scriptures, which were more certain than the declarations of the Fathers. After the incarnation of the Logos, that is, after the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, he worshipped only one nature, that of God made flesh and man (*μίαν φύσιν προσκυνεῖν, καὶ ταύτην Θεοῦ σαρκωθέντος καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντος*). Thereupon he had read from a little book which he produced, and added that the expression had been falsely ascribed to him, that the Logos had brought His body from heaven; this he had never said. But that our Lord Jesus Christ consisted of two Persons, united in one Hypostasis, this he had not found in the declarations of the holy Fathers, nor should he accept it if he should find it in one, because, as he had said, the Holy Scriptures were to be preferred to the teachings of the Fathers.—At last Eutyches had, indeed, acknowledged that HE who was born of the Virgin Mary was true God and true man, but he added that His body was not of the same substance with ours.

The second envoy of the Synod, the deacon Andrew, asserted that he had heard the same from the mouth of Eutyches, and this was also confirmed by the deacon of Bishop Basil of Seleucia, named Athanasius, who had been present during the whole conversation with Eutyches.

Upon this, Eusebius of Dorylæum said that what the three witnesses had testified would certainly suffice (to make them take proceedings against Eutyches), but he prayed them to invite him a second time. He was ready to prove by many witnesses that he was a heretic. Archbishop Flavian now sent the two priests, Mamas and Theophilus, to exhort him to appear before the Synod, as he had not only given offence by that which Eusebius of Dorylæum had brought against him, but also by his most recent heterodox declarations

to the deputies of the Synod. If he would come and abjure his error, he should be forgiven.

The two new envoys of the Synod took with them also a short letter to Eutyches, to the effect that "he was now summoned for the second time, and must not fail to appear, if he did not wish to experience the stringency of the divine canons. His excuse that he had resolved never to leave the convent was not valid."¹

While Mamas and Theophilus were making their way to Eutyches, and the Synod were waiting their return, Eusebius of Dorylæum mentioned that he had learnt that Eutyches had sent a writing (τόμος) on the faith round the convents, and was stirring up the monks. This should be examined, for it concerned the safety of the Synod. The priest at the Martyrium (chapel) of Hebdomus (Septimus) should declare whether Eutyches had not sent a "tome," and asked for signatures. This priest, Abraham by name, when required by Flavian to state the truth, declared that the priest and Archimandrite Emmanuel had, according to his own statement, received such a tome, sent to him by Eutyches, with the request that he would subscribe it. On the requirement of Eusebius of Dorylæum, several priests and deacons were then sent to the other monasteries, in order to ascertain whether Eutyches had ventured upon the same with them.²

In the meantime Mamas and Theophilus had returned. The first declared: "When we came to the monastery of Eutyches, we met some monks standing before the gate, and we asked them to announce us, as we had a commission from the Archbishop and the holy Synod to speak with the Archimandrite. They answered: 'The Archimandrite is sick, and cannot admit you; tell us, therefore, what you want and why you are sent.' We were not satisfied with this, and declared that we had only been sent to Eutyches, etc. Thereupon they went into the convent, and speedily returned with another monk of the name of Eleusinius, whom the Archimandrite had commissioned to hear us in his stead. We replied: 'Was it in this way that they dealt with envoys of the most holy Archbishop

¹ Hardouin, t. ii. p. 139 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. pp. 698-706.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 706; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 143.

and the holy and great Synod?' and then remarked that they muttered something to each other in embarrassment. It seemed to them very suspicious that we should bring a written decree with us; but we assured them that there was nothing hard in it, and nothing secret, and acquainted them with the contents. They immediately returned into the convent, and we were then conducted to Eutyches. We handed to him the letter of the Synod; he had it read in our presence, and said: 'It is my purpose never to leave the convent until death compels me to do so. And, besides, the holy Synod and the pious Archbishop know that I am old and weak.' We requested him again to appear and answer for himself; but he replied: 'I do not leave the convent, for so I have resolved. The holy Archbishop and the holy Synod may do what seems good to them, only let them not trouble themselves to invite me a third time.' He would also have given us a letter to bring with us, but we did not receive it, declaring that if he had anything to say, he might appear personally before the Synod. Then he wanted to have the letter read to us, but we would not agree to that either, but took our departure, while he said: 'I will then send this letter to the Synod.'

After the second envoy of the Synod, the priest Theophilus, had testified that he had heard the same as Mamas, Eusebius of Dorykeum again addressed the Synod, and said: "The guilty have ever ways of escaping; Eutyches must now be brought here, even against his will." The Synod resolved to summon him a third time, and Flavian commissioned the two priests, Memnon and Epiphanius, and the deacon Germanus, to convey to him the third invitation, again in writing. It said: "It is not unknown to thee what the holy canons threaten to the disobedient, and to those who refuse to answer for themselves. In order that thou mayest not now plunge thyself into misfortune, we invite thee for the third time, and trust it may please thee to appear early on the day after to-morrow, that is, on Wednesday the 17th of November."¹

Before the expiration of this time, on Tuesday the 16th of November, the fourth session was held. Archbishop Flavian was speaking on the subject of the dogma, when they were

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 707-711; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 146 sq.

informed that envoys from Eutyches, the monks and deacons Eleusinius, Constantine, and Constantius, with the Archimandrite Abraham, were at the door and desired admission. The Archbishop asked them to enter, and Abraham then said that Eutyches was ill, and had been unable to sleep the whole night, but had sighed and called him to him, that he might speak for him with the Archbishop. Flavian replied that they would not urge him, but wait for his recovery, but that then he must appear, for he was not coming to men unknown, but to fathers and brothers, and even to those who had hitherto been his friends. He had given offence to many, and therefore must of necessity defend himself. At the time that Nestorius endangered the truth, he had for the sake of that left his monastery and gone into the city, and so much the more was it his duty to do so now, for the sake of himself, and of the truth as well. If he acknowledged and anathematized his error, then he would receive forgiveness for the past; for the future, however, he must give assurance to the Synod and the Archbishop that he believed in accordance with the explanations of the Fathers, and that he would not again teach anything different. — At the close of the session, when they had all risen, the Archbishop further spoke as follows: "You know the zeal of the accuser,—fire itself seems cool to him in comparison with pure zeal for religion. God knows! I besought him to desist, and to yield; as, however, he persisted, what could I do? Shall I scatter you (the monks), and not rather gather? To scatter is the work of enemies; but it is the work of fathers to gather" (Luke xi. 23; John x. 12).¹

We can see that Archbishop Flavian had an earnest desire for the maintenance of the peace of the Church, but duty required him to hear and examine the charges against Eutyches, and the heretical obstinacy of the latter made all peaceable understanding impossible. He had been invited to appear on Wednesday the 17th of November. On this day the fifth session was held, and Memnon, Epiphanius, and Germanus gave an account of the result of their mission to Eutyches. Memnon declared: "After we had handed Eutyches the letter of the Synod, he explained that he had sent the Archi-

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 711-715; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 147 sq.

mandrite Abraham to the Archbishop and the Synod that he might in his name give his assent to the declarations of the Synods of Nicæa and Ephesus, and to all that Cyril had uttered."

Eusebius of Dorylæum here interrupted the narrator, and said: "Even if Eutyches will now assent, because some have told him that he must yield to necessity and subscribe, yet I am not therefore in the wrong, for it is with reference, not to the future, but to the past, that I have accused him." The Archbishop agreed to this; and Eusebius asserted further that he had entreated Eutyches, not merely once or twice, but frequently, to abandon his error, and that he could bring forward many witnesses against him.

After this interruption Memnon further related: "Eutyches said that on account of his sickness he had sent Abraham. But when I urged him more strongly to appear in person, he decided to await first the return of the Abbot Abraham, since he perhaps would soften the Archbishop and the Synod. When I remarked that we would remain with him until the return of Abraham, he asked us to request the Archbishop and the Synod to give him a respite for this week, and then he would, if it pleased God, present himself on the Monday of next week."¹

The two other deputies of the Synod confirmed this statement, and those clerics were then heard whom the Synod had sent and commissioned to obtain information respecting the attempts of Eutyches to stir up the monks. In their name the priest Peter testified: "We went first into the convent of the Archimandrite and Presbyter Martin, and learned that Eutyches had certainly sent a writing to him on the 12th of November, and had requested him to sign it. On Martin replying that it was not his business, but that of the bishops, to subscribe declarations of faith, Eutyches sent him the reply: 'If you do not support me, then the Archbishop, after he has overthrown me, will do the same with you.' For the rest, the Archimandrite Martin had not even read the writing sent by Eutyches, and could only say as to its contents that Eutyches had sent him word that it contained what the Synod

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 715-719; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 150 sq.

of Ephesus and Cyril had taught. Thereupon we had recourse to the Archimandrite and Presbyter Faustus, who told us that the monks Constantine and Eleusinius had brought him the writing of Eutyches for his signature, and had said that it contained the declarations of the Fathers of Nicæa and Ephesus. On his replying that he must, before subscribing, compare the tome with the Acts of the two Councils which he possessed, in order to see that nothing was added, they had departed again discontented. Another president of a monastery, Job, stated that Eutyches had sent him no writing, but had bid them tell him that the Archbishop would shortly lay something before him for his signature; but he was not to give it. Finally, we went to (abbot) Emmanuel and to Abraham, who asserted that they had received no writing and no request from Eutyches."

Thereupon Eusebius of Dorylæum said: "The offence of Eutyches in attempting to stir up the monks and in teaching error is now shown, and therefore we must proceed against him. Besides, he is a liar, since on one occasion he said it was his principle not to go out, and on another he promised to come." Archbishop Flavian, however, was unwilling even now to proceed to extremities, and granted Eutyches the respite he had desired until the 22d of November, remarking that in case he did not appear even then, he should be deprived of his sacerdotal dignity, and deposed from his headship of the monastery.¹

On Saturday the 20th of November the bishops assembled for the sixth session, and Eusebius of Dorylæum demanded that on the next Monday, when Eutyches should appear, four of his friends should also be invited as witnesses, namely, the priest Narses, the Syncellus of Eutyches; the Archimandrite Maximus his friend; the deacon Constantius his secretary, and the already-mentioned monk and deacon Eleusinius. After Flavian had assented to this request, the indefatigable Eusebius brought forward one other point. He had learned, he said, that Eutyches had said to the clerical envoys Mamas and Theophilus, who had gone to him with the second invitation, something which was not in the Acts, but which would

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 719-724; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 153-155.

throw a clear light upon his views. They ought to hear those deputies of the Synod on that subject. The only one of them present was Theophilus, and he testified: "Eutyches wished to dispute with us; but when Mamas would not agree to this, he said in the presence of the priest Narses, the Archimandrite Maximus, and several other monks: Where in the Scripture is anything said of two natures, and what Father has stated that God the Logos has two natures? (That certainly no one said!!) Mamas answered him that the *ὁμοούσιος* τὸο was nowhere in Holy Scripture, and yet this was brought out by the explanations of the Fathers, and so it was in reference to the two natures. Then I (Theophilus) asked if God the Logos were perfect (in Christ). Eutyches said He was. I asked further, whether the man who appeared in the flesh (*ἄνθρωπος ὁ σαρκωθείς*) was also perfect. He also affirmed this, and then I said: If, then, (in Christ) God is perfectly present, and a perfect man, then those two perfects form the one Son. Why then should we not say: The one Son consists of two natures? Eutyches answered: Far be it from him to say that Christ consisted of two natures, or to dispute respecting the nature of God. If they were pleased to depose him or to undertake anything else against him, they must do it. He must abide by the faith which he had received."

After this testimony Flavian asked why Theophilus had not said this at the very beginning, and he replied: "Because we had not been sent for this purpose (to make inquiries into the faith of Eutyches), but only to invite him. As we were not questioned about that, we thought we ought to be silent." At this moment Mamas, the other envoy of the Synod, arrived. They read to him the new statements of his colleague, and he testified to nearly the same, with the like excuse for his previous silence. He also added: "Eutyches said, God the Logos became flesh in order to raise up again human nature which had fallen. I immediately replied: Consider, you say, to raise up human nature; but by what (other) nature is then this human nature assumed and raised up? Eutyches (not attending to this) said: In the Holy Scriptures I find nothing of two natures. But I replied: It is the same with *ὁμοούσιος* which is not found there; but we are taught by

the Fathers respecting the *ὁμοούσιος* and also respecting the two natures. Then Eutyches said that he did not examine into the nature of God, and would not speak of two natures. Here he was, he said, if he were condemned, then might the convent be his grave, and he would willingly suffer anything; but two natures he would not confess."

Flavian found the new testimonies of the two envoys clear and sufficient, and so closed this session.¹

The seventh and last session, which was also the most important, was in conclusion held on the following Monday, the 22d of November, and in order to increase its solemnity the books of the holy Gospels were publicly set forth. As Eusebius of Dorylæum wished to appear as accuser, he placed himself first at the door of the Secretarium in which the session was held, and asked for admission. Archbishop Flavian gave permission, and at the same time sent two deacons, Philadelphius and Cyril, in order to inquire, in the neighbourhood of the *Episcopeion* (the episcopal dwelling), whether Eutyches had arrived, and then to invite him to the assembly.

They soon returned with the information that he had been sought for in the whole church (the *Episcopeion* lay close to the church), but neither he nor any of his people had been seen. Flavian again sent two deacons, and these brought the intelligence that they had not seen Eutyches himself, but they had heard that he was coming directly with a great multitude of soldiers, monks, and servants of the Prefect of the Prætorian guard. It was shortly announced by the presbyter John, who was an official (*ἐκδικος*) of the Synod, that Eutyches had now really arrived, but his convoy would not allow him to enter, unless the Synod first promised that his person should again be restored to liberty. Among his attendants, he said, was also the exalted Silentiar Magnus (assessor in the privy council), as representative of the Emperor. Flavian requested them to enter, and the Silentiar read to him the letter with which the Emperor had entrusted him, as follows: "I wish the peace of the Church and the maintenance of the orthodox faith, which was asserted by the Fathers at Nicæa and Ephesus,

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 723-730; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 155 sqq.

and because I know that the Patrician Florentius is orthodox and proved in the faith, therefore it is my will that he be present at the sessions of the Synod, as the faith is in question."¹

The bishops of the Synod received this decree with the usual Byzantine courtesies, crying out: "Many years to the Emperor, his faith is great; many years to the pious, orthodox, high-priestly Emperor (τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ βασιλεῖ)." Thereupon Flavian declared: "We all know that Florentius is orthodox, and are willing that he should be present at our session. But Eutyches must also say whether he agrees to his presence." Eutyches replied: "Do what God and your holiness will; I am your servant." Thereupon the Silentiar brought Florentius forward, and the Synod appointed that the accuser and the accused should place themselves in the midst, and that all the previous proceedings in the matter between Eusebius and Eutyches should be read. This was done by the deacon and notary Aetius. When he came to the passage in the letter of Cyril to the Orientals (pp. 130, 137) in which it is said: "We confess our Lord Jesus Christ as perfect God and perfect man, and as of one substance with the Father according to the Godhead, and of one substance with us according to the manhood; for an union of the two natures has taken place (δύο γὰρ φύσεων ἕνωσις γέγονε), therefore we confess One Christ, One Lord, and, in accordance with this union without confusion (τῆς ἀσυγχύτου ἐνώσεως), we call the holy Virgin God-bearer, because God the Logos was made flesh and man, and in the conception united the temple which He assumed from her (Mary) with Himself,"—at this point Eusebius of Dorylæum exclaimed: "Certainly such is not confessed by this man here (Eutyches); he has never believed this, but the contrary, and so he has taught every one who has come to him." The Patrician Florentius asked that Eutyches should now be questioned as to whether he agreed with what had been read; but Eusebius of Dorylæum objected, remarking that if Eutyches now agreed, then he, Eusebius, must appear as having been lightly a slanderer, and should lose his office. Eutyches had already threatened him even with banishment

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 730-734; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 158 sq.

to the Oasis, and he was rich and influential, whilst he himself was poor and possessed nothing. Florentius renewed his request that Eutyches should be asked how he believed and taught (and why he expressed himself differently at different times), and Eusebius now agreed on condition that no prejudice should arise to him from the present assent of Eutyches; for he was able to prove that *previously* he had not taught correctly.

Flavian calmed him by the assurance that if Eutyches now agreed there should not arise from this the slightest disadvantage for Eusebius; and then he asked Eutyches: "Say now, dost thou acknowledge the union of two natures (εἰ ἐκ δύο φύσεων ἔνωσιν ὁμολογεῖς)?" Eutyches said: "Yes;" but Eusebius of Dorylaeum put the question more exactly, and asked: "Dost thou confess the existence of two natures even *after* the incarnation, and that Christ is of one nature with us after the flesh, or not?"¹ Eutyches answered: "I have not come to dispute, but to testify to your holiness what I think. My view, however, is set down in this writing; command, therefore, that it be read." To the request of Flavian that he would read it himself he returned a refusal, remarking that he could not, and the like; whereupon the Archbishop said: "If it is thine own confession of faith, why shouldest thou need the paper?" To which Eutyches answered: "That is my belief, I pray to the Father with the Son, and to the Son with the Father, and to the Holy Ghost with the Father and Son. I confess that His (the Son's) bodily presence is from the body of the holy Virgin, and that He became perfect man for our salvation. Thus I confess before the Father, before the Son, and before the Holy Ghost, and before your holiness."² The Archbishop asked further: "Dost thou confess also that the one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, is of one substance with the Father as to His Godhead, and of one substance with His mother as to His manhood?" Eutyches replied: "I have already declared my opinion, leave me now in peace." When, however, the Archbishop further asked: "Dost thou confess that Christ consists of two natures?"

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 734-738; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 159 sq.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 739; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 163.

he replied, "I have not hitherto presumed to dispute concerning the nature of my God; but that He is of one substance with us have I hitherto, as I affirm, never said. Up to this present day have I never said that the body of our Lord and God is of one substance with us. I do confess, however, that the holy Virgin is of one substance with us, and that our God is made of our flesh." The Archbishop, as well as Bishop Basil of Seleucia and the imperial commissioner Florentius, now represented to Eutyches that if he acknowledged that Mary was of one substance with us, and that Christ had taken His manhood from her, then it followed of itself that He, according to His manhood, was also of one substance with us. Eutyches replied: "Consider well, I say not that the body of man has become the body of God, but I speak of a human body of God, and say that the Lord was made flesh of the Virgin. If you wish me to add further that His body is of one substance with ours, then I do this; but I do not understand this as though I denied that He is the Son of God. Formerly I did not generally speak of an unity of substance (after the flesh), but now I will do so, because your holiness thus requires it." To the reply of the Archbishop: "Thou doest it then only of compulsion, and not because it is thy faith?" Eutyches made an evasive answer, and remarked again that hitherto he had never so spoken, but that now he would do so in accordance with the will of the Synod. In this answer there was involved the reproach that the Synod had allowed itself to make a doctrinal innovation, which Flavian decisively rejected. Thereupon Florentius asked, with precision and insight into the matter: "Dost thou believe that our Lord, who was born of the Virgin, is of one substance with us, and that after the incarnation He is *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*, or not?" And Eutyches answered: "I confess that before the union (of the Godhead and manhood) He was of two natures, but after the union I confess only one nature" (*ὁμολογῶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγενῆσθαι τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἔνωσιν μίαν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ*).¹

The Synod finally demanded of Eutyches a public declaration and an anathema on every view which was in opposition

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 742 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 163 sq.

to the doctrine which had been expressed. He answered again equivocally: "He would now indeed, since the Synod so required, accept the manner of speech in question (that Christ was of one substance with us, and of two natures), but he found it neither in Holy Scripture nor in the Fathers collectively, and therefore could not pronounce an anathema (on the non-acceptance of that expression), because in that case he would be anathematizing his Fathers." Upon this the Synod arose and cried: "To him be anathema;" and the Archbishop asked: "What does this man deserve who does not confess the right faith, but persists in his perverseness?" Eutyches endeavoured once more to evade the condemnation by the distinction which he had already brought forward: "That he would now indeed accept the required manner of speaking in accordance with the will of the Synod, but he could not pronounce the anathema."

The Patrician Florentius, however, shut him up within narrower limits by the question: "Dost thou confess two natures in Christ, and His unity of substance with us?" And when Eutyches replied: "I read the writings of S. Cyril and S. Athanasius: *before* the union they speak of two natures, but *after* the union only of one;" he asked still more precisely: "Dost thou confess two natures even *after* the union? if not, then wilt thou be condemned." Eutyches then requested that the books of Cyril and Athanasius should be read; but Basil of Seleucia remarked that the Acts say (he himself disallowed it in some measure at the Robber-Synod): "If thou dost not acknowledge two natures after the union also, then thou acceptest a mingling and confusion (of the natures)."¹ Florentius cried out: "He who does not say of two natures, and who does not acknowledge two natures, has not the right faith." And the Synod replied: "And he who accepts anything only by compulsion (as Eutyches), does not believe in it. Many years to the Emperors!" At last the Archbishop announced the sentence: "Eutyches, a priest and archimandrite, has, by previous statements, and even now by his own confessions, shown himself to be entangled in the perversity of Valentinus and Apollinaris,

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 746; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 167.

without allowing himself to be won back to the genuine dogmas by our exhortation and instruction. Therefore we, bewailing his complete perversity, have decreed, for the sake of Christ whom he has reviled, that he be deposed from every priestly office, expelled from our communion, and deprived of his headship over the convent. And all who henceforth hold communion with him, and have recourse to him, must know that they too are liable to the penalty of excommunication." This sentence was subscribed by Flavian and the rest of the bishops (according to the Greek text 28, according to the old Latin version 31) with the formula *ὁπίσας ὑπέγραψα*, that is, *JUDICANS subscripsi*, while the twenty-three archimandrites who likewise, but somewhat later, subscribed, used only the expression *ὑπέγραψα*, since they had a right not to pronounce *judgment*, but only to give their assent.¹

SEC. 173. *Eutyches and Flavian both endeavour to gain over public opinion to their side.*

It was to be foreseen that Eutyches and his friends would bring forward many complaints and accusations against this Synod. We shall see, however, that some of these were quite futile, others incapable of proof, and that the few which could be proved were of no importance.

After the close of the Synod, and when its sentence was known, there arose great excitement among the people, and Eutyches, as he complains, was on his return home publicly insulted by the populace.² He brought this forward again as so far a reproach to Archbishop Flavian that he had not hindered it. He speaks even of having come into danger of his life,³ from which, as he flatteringly writes to Leo the Great, he had only been saved by the intercession of this Pope (whose protection he had invoked) with the imperial soldiers.⁴ For the rest he did not fail to have put up at various public

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 746-754; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 167-172.

² Eutyches, *Ep. ad S. Leonem*, among the letters of S. Leo the Great in the edition of the Ballerini, t. i. No. xxi. p. 739; Mansi, t. vi. pp. 1323 and 1014.

³ In Mansi, t. vi. p. 629; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 98.

⁴ *Epist. ad Leonem*, see above, note 2, and below, p. 205 f.

places in Constantinople placards (*contestatorios libellos*), in which he complained abusively of what had been done, and sought to justify his teaching.¹ He also made his complaint to the Emperor, and here he met with no unfavourable hearing, so that Flavian from this time fell into still greater disfavour.²

In order, however, to gain to his side the most distinguished bishops of remote provinces, he addressed to several of them cautiously composed letters; and one of these, which was sent to Pope Leo, we have already noted. He says in it, that at the suggestion of Satan, Bishop Eusebius of Dorylæum had sent an accusation against him to Bishop Flavian of Constantinople, and to a number of bishops accidentally assembled for other causes, and had charged him with heresy, not in the interest of truth, but in order to ruin him and to embroil the Church. Invited to the Synod, he had been unable to appear in consequence of serious illness, but had been willing to transmit to them his confession of faith in writing. Flavian had not accepted this writing, nor would he allow it to be read, but required that Eutyches should confess two natures and anathematize all the opponents of this doctrine. He had not been able to do this, since even Athanasius, Gregory, Julius, and Felix had rejected the expression "two natures;" and, besides, he had wished to add nothing to the confession of faith of Nicæa (and Ephesus), and had not ventured to undertake inquiries into the nature of God the Word. He had therefore prayed that the Synod would acquaint the Pope with the matter, that he might pronounce a judgment, to which he would then entirely submit (he thus maintains that he had appealed to Rome, and speaks of it *ad captandam benevolentiam*, in a manner which must have been very pleasing at Rome). But they had not listened to him, but had suddenly broken off the Synod and published the sentence against him, so that he would have come in danger of

¹ Cf. Leonis *Epist.* xxiii. in Baller. t. i. p. 763; in Mansi, t. v. p. 1338; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 1; Liberat. *Breviar.* c. 11, in Galland. *Biblioth.* t. xii.

² Cf. the letter of Flavian to Pope Leo among the letters of the latter, No. xxvi. in Baller. t. i. p. 786; Mansi, t. v. p. 1351; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 4 sq.; and the *autor anonym.* of the *Breviculus historie Eutychianistarum*, published by Sirmond in the *Appendix codicis Theodos.* p. 112, where it is said: *Offenditur imperator.*

his life, if the military had not, at the intercession of the Pope, delivered him. Then they had also compelled the heads of other convents to subscribe his deposition, which had not been done in the case of Nestorius, and had prevented him from circulating writings in his own justification (the placards) among the people, and having them read. He now appealed to Leo, the defender of religion, and adjured him, impartially and without being affected by the previous intrigues, to pronounce a sentence in reference to the faith, and henceforth to protect him (Eutyches), especially as he had spent seventy years in all continence and chastity. Finally, he presented two writings, the accusation of Eusebius and his new paper which had not been received (according to the supposition of the Ballerini, the document of appeal); besides (thirdly), his declaration of faith (probably a copy of the placard); and (fourthly) the declarations of the Fathers on the two natures.¹

To this letter the Ballerini, in their edition of the letters of Leo, have added another fragment, which, in their view, contains the beginning of Eutyches' placard. He there asserts his orthodoxy. In the remaining part, now lost, the *contestatio ad populum*, that is, the complaint of the wrong which he had suffered, and the like, may have been contained.²

A second letter to the same effect was sent by Eutyches to the then highly renowned Bishop of Ravenna, Peter Chrysologus, but we have now only the answers to it. Peter Chrysologus there laments the contentiousness of the theologians of his day, but prudently does not enter further upon the subject itself, but only remarks: "He would have answered more fully if his brother Flavian had, on his side, also made him acquainted with the whole subject. Upon a one-sided statement he would form no judgment. For the rest, Eutyches must acquiesce in that which the Pope had written,³ since the holy Peter, who still lives in his see,

¹ Eutyches, *Epist. ad Leonem* among the letters of the latter, No. xxi. in Baller. t. i. p. 739 sqq.; Mansi, t. v. pp. 1323 and 1014. Quesnel supposes that this letter to Leo was a circular letter, and that identical copies were sent to other bishops. Cf. Walch, *Ketzergesch.* Bd. vi. S. 161.

² Cf. note 12 of the Ballerini on *Epist.* xxiii., and notes 13-16 on *Epist.* xxi.

³ Whether the now lost answer of Leo to the previously mentioned letter of

imparts the truth to those who seek it. We, however, cannot decide upon matters of faith without the assent of the Roman bishop."¹

It is not without doubt, but it is very probable, that Eutyches now appealed also to Dioscurus of Alexandria and other great bishops, although no documents on the subject are extant.²

On the other side, Flavian, Archbishop of Constantinople, only did his duty when he caused the sentence which had been pronounced against Eutyches to be published in his churches, and when he required of the various convents and heads of convents that they should subscribe and thus accept the sentence.³ In this way were added the already mentioned (p. 204) subscriptions of twenty-three archimandrites, which we still possess. In particular, Flavian sent deputies into the convent of Eutyches himself, with the command that the monks should no longer recognize him as abbot, that they should no longer speak with him, that they should no longer attend divine service with him, and that they should not leave the administration of their property any longer in his hands.⁴

It was further natural, that Flavian should acquaint the bishops of other provinces with what had been done. That he should do so, and also transmit the Acts of the Synod (the *τόμος*) to the Oriental bishops, had been requested in the second session by Bishop Sabbas of Paltus in Syria.⁵ That this was actually done is testified by the Patriarch Domnus of Antioch, who declared at the Robber-Synod that the decree of deposition on Eutyches had been sent to him from Constantinople, and had been subscribed by him.⁶ Besides,

Eutyches is meant, or the celebrated *Epist. dogmatica Leonis*, is doubtful. Cf. Walch, *l.c.* S. 163.

¹ Among the letters of Leo, No. xxv. p. 775 sqq. in the ed. of the Ballerini; Mansi, t. v. p. 1347; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 21. Cf. Walch, *l.c.* S. 161 f.

² Cf. Walch, *l.c.* S. 161 and 163.

³ Cf. the complaint of Eutyches in Mansi, t. vi. p. 641; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 103 sq.

⁴ Cf. the complaint of the monks in Mansi, t. vi. p. 864; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 234.

⁵ In Mansi, t. vi. p. 693; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 138.

⁶ In Mansi, t. vi. p. 836; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 218.

in regard to this matter, we possess a correspondence between Flavian, Pope Leo, and the Emperor Theodosius the younger. The first of these letters, according to the investigations of the Ballerini, was written by Flavian to Leo a short time after the close of the Synod at Constantinople, towards the end of the year 448, or early in 449, and begins with the lamentation that the Archbishop has not been able to save one of his clergy, and snatch him from ruin. There were people, he said, who, while they wore sheep's clothing, were inwardly ravening wolves. So it was with Eutyches; he had appeared to maintain orthodoxy against Nestorius, and yet he had himself endeavoured to destroy the orthodox faith, and to renew the old heresies of Valentinus and Apollinaris. He had undauntedly declared before the holy Synod that we should not believe that after the incarnation Christ consisted of *two* natures in *one* person, and that His flesh was of the same substance as ours. The Virgin who bare Him was of the same flesh with us, but the Lord had not assumed from her a body of the same substance as ours, and the body of the Lord was not the body of a man, although the body which came from the Virgin was a human one. For the sake of brevity Flavian further appeals to the proceedings which had taken place some time ago (*πάλαι*) in this matter (Synod at Constantinople), the Acts of which he sent to the Pope (in the epistolary style: "I have sent"), according to which Eutyches was deposed. The Pope should make the bishops who were subject to him acquainted with it, so that they might have no communion with the heretic.¹

Before this letter reached Rome the Pope received a letter from the Emperor and one from Eutyches himself, from which we have given an extract above (p. 205). Leo now wrote on the 18th of February 449, as the subscription shows, to Flavian as follows: "The Emperor had made him acquainted with the ecclesiastical troubles in Constantinople, and Leo only wondered that Flavian had told him nothing of them, and had not taken care that the matter should be communicated to him first. He had also received a letter

¹ S. Leonis *Ep.* xxii. in Baller. t. i. p. 745 sqq.; Mansi, t. v. p. 1330; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 8. Cf. Walch, *l.c.* S. 165.

from Eutyches, who complained that, although innocent, he had been excommunicated on the accusation of Eusebius of Dorylæum, and that his appeal to Rome had not been regarded. Flavian should inform him of all, for until he knew everything accurately he could not judge in favour of either. Flavian should also send him an able envoy, who might give him complete information respecting the novelty which had arisen. He thoroughly desired the restoration of peace, that those who maintained error might be turned away from their error, and that the orthodox might be confirmed by the papal approval. And this could not be difficult, as Eutyches had declared in his letter that he was ready to correct what should be found blameworthy in him. In such a matter," Leo says towards the end, "above all an effort must be made *ut sine strepitu concertationum et custodiatur caritas, et veritas defendatur.*"¹

Leo's letter of the same date to the Emperor is shorter. He rejoices that Theodosius has not only the heart of an emperor, but also that of a priest, and is rightly anxious that no discord should arise. *For then is the empire best established when the Holy Trinity is served in unity.* Further on he comes to speak of the letter of Eutyches, and of the accusation of Eusebius of Dorylæum which Eutyches had transmitted to him, and remarks that these two documents do not represent the matter with sufficient completeness. He had therefore written to Flavian, and had censured him for his silence.²

To this Flavian replied in his second letter to Leo (No. 26), in which he explains somewhat more fully the heresy of Eutyches, and shows how his doctrine of one nature is in opposition to a clear utterance of the Synod of Ephesus.³ Eutyches had therefore been deposed by the Synod, as the Pope would perceive from the Acts attached to this letter. The Pope should know that Eutyches, after his righteous deposition, instead of repenting and amending, was, on the

¹ In Baller. *l.c.* pp. 761-765 ; Mansi, t. v. p. 1338 sqq.

² In Baller. *l.c.* p. 767 ; Mansi, t. v. p. 1341 sqq.

³ Particularly to an utterance of Cyril's, which had been approved by the Synod of Ephesus (p. 48). We gave it above (p. 21) in italics.

contrary, endeavouring to embarrass the Church of Constantinople, was putting up placards full of insults and calumnies, was importuning the Emperor with petitions, and treading the holy canons under foot. He (Flavian) had received the letter of Leo through the Count Pansophius, and had learned from that how Eutyches had lied; for it was not true that during the Synod he had put in an appeal to Rome. The Pope should certainly confirm the canonical deposition of Eutyches in a special brief, and strengthen the faith of the Emperor. In that way all would be made peaceful, and the future Synod, of which they were already talking, would be rendered superfluous.¹

It is evident that this letter was composed *before* the official convocation of the new Synod (Robber-Synod), which was published on the 30th of March 449. The letter probably belongs to the same month.² The Pope used the first opportunity, the 21st of May 449, in order to acquaint Archbishop Flavian briefly that he had received his letter. He already acknowledges that Eutyches had erred from the right faith, and promises to send a complete letter on the subject by Flavian's messenger on his return, in order to show how the whole matter must be judged.³ He refers to his *Epistola dogmatica ad Flavianum*, which afterwards became so famous, and of which we shall presently have to speak.

The Emperor's letter to the Pope, which was mentioned above, is a proof to us that Eutyches had gained the favour of the court, and that Theodosius had endeavoured to save him. He therefore, as he says himself,⁴ frequently got Archbishop Flavian to come to him, in order to induce him to be contented with the Nicene Creed as confirmed at Ephesus, which Eutyches had naturally accepted without hesitation. As Flavian did not and would not agree to this, the Emperor became very angry; and as Eutyches continued to accuse the Archbishop himself of heresy, Theodosius went

¹ In Baller. *l.c.* p. 782 sqq.; Mansi, t. v. p. 1351 sqq.

² In Baller. *l.c.* p. 781, Nota a; and in Mansi, *l.c.* p. 1351, Nota a.

³ S. Leonis *Epist.* No. xxvii. p. 792, ed. Baller.; in Mansi, t. v. p. 1359.

⁴ In Mansi, t. vi. p. 597; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 78. Cf. Walch, *l.c.* S. 171.

so far as to require a confession of faith from Flavian, which he presented, and which has come down to us.¹

SEC. 174. *The Examination on account of the pretended falsification of the Synodal Acts.*

Making use of the favourable disposition of the Emperor, Eutyches brought a new complaint in the early part of the year 449, that the Acts of the Synod of Constantinople, which Flavian had had prepared, were in many places falsified, and that therefore the notaries of Flavian, together with the deacon Athanasius of Seleucia, and the clerics whom the Synod had sent to Eutyches, should be examined in the presence of Thalassius (Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia) and other bishops.² The Emperor acceded to this request on the 8th of April 449,³ and on the same day the imperial tribune, notary, and referendar Macedonius acquainted the bishops who were assembled under the presidency of Thalassius in the baptistery of the church of Constantinople with the Emperor's command. Flavian is not included in the list of bishops, but many others are there who had co-operated in the deposition of Eutyches.⁴

In consequence of this a second and greater synodal assembly of thirty-four bishops took place on the 13th of April in the greater portico of the church at Constantinople under the presidency of Flavian. Fifteen of them had also been, in the previous year, members of that Synod which had pronounced the condemnation of Eutyches. Besides these, the Patrician Florentius was also present again on this occasion, and with him two other imperial officials, the Count Mamas and the tribune Macedonius, already mentioned.

After the short minutes of the assembly of April 8 were

¹ In *Liberat. Breviar.* c. xi. ; in Galland. t. xii. p. 139; and in Mansi, t. vi. p. 539, and viii. p. 824; in Hardouin, t. ii. p. 7. Cf. Walch, *l.c.* S. 171.

² The letter of Eutyches to the Emperor, in Mansi, t. vi. p. 764; and Hardouin, t. ii. p. 177.

³ Mansi, t. vi. p. 757; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 173.

⁴ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 757-761; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 173-176. A translation of the Acts of this and the following commission (abridged) is given by Fuchs, *Biblioth. der Kirchenvers.* Bd. iv. S. 385 ff.

read, Florentius asked whether representatives of Eutyches were present. When this question was answered in the affirmative, Eusebius of Dorylæum and Meliphthongus, Bishop of Juliopolis, raised a question as to their admission, as they thought that Eutyches himself ought personally to appear. When, however, the tribune explained that, as Eutyches, being excommunicated, would not venture personally to be present, the Emperor had ordered him to send representatives, they acquiesced, and the spokesmen for Eutyches were admitted. They were the three monks Constantine, Eleusinius, and Constantius. Thereupon the tribune requested that the bishops who had been present at the deposition of Eutyches should swear an oath that they would say the truth; but Basil of Seleucia, one of the most distinguished among those present, rejected this requirement as inadmissible, and as something which had never been done before; but, on the other hand, promised that all should speak with the same conscientiousness as though they stood before the holy altar.

Whether Macedonius upon this gave up his demand the Acts do not say, but they inform us that the petition which Eutyches had addressed to the Emperor, and which we have already mentioned, was now read. Then the notaries of Flavian, who had drawn up the criminated acts, were required to stand forth in the midst of the assembly, namely, the deacons Asterius, Aetius, Nonnus, Asclepiades, and Procopius. Aetius desired at first to be more accurately informed of what they were accused, and that they should be allowed time to reply. But Florentius refused this as an evasion of the question, and declared that the Acts should be read and their genuineness examined, but that no definite accusation should be brought forward against the notaries. To this Archbishop Flavian also agreed, remarking that the Acts had been drawn up by his notaries. If they were genuine, they must now maintain this without hesitation; but if anything in them were false, they must speak the truth as before the judgment-seat of God, and not conceal the falsifier. Florentius acknowledged that the Archbishop thus spoke from a sense of his innocence, and after another objection of Aetius had been put aside, they proceeded to the actual examination of the Acts, in such wise

that the authentic copy of the notaries of Flavian was read from section to section, and the representatives of Eutyches were required to compare that which was read with their own copy which they had brought with them, and at once to bring forward their remarks in opposition.¹

No objection was made to the Acts of the first and second sessions of Constantinople (pp. 190, 191); but after the reading of the minutes of the third session one of the representatives of Eutyches, the deacon and monk Constantine, remarked that an expression of Eutyches had not been correctly reproduced. He had not said to those whom the Synod then sent to him: "If the Fathers of the Church erred in some expressions, I do not blame them for this, but only inquire in Holy Scripture" (p. 192). Instead, however, of stating how Eutyches did then actually express himself, he only explained his own view, "that the Fathers had spoken diversely, and I accept all from them, but not as a *rule of faith* (*εἰς κανόνα δὲ πίστεως οὐδέχομαι*)." As, however, he noticed that this expression was also very offensive, he requested that it should not be used to the prejudice of Eutyches. He was answered properly that the representatives of Eutyches at their entrance had themselves given the assurance that they possessed full instructions and unrestricted authority from him, so that he would acknowledge all their explanations as his own words, and for that reason the request just made was quite inadmissible. Embarrassed by this answer, Constantine requested that the words, "but not as a rule of faith," might be struck out, for he had uttered them only inconsiderately, being confused by the great noise in the assembly.

Bishop Seleucus remarked that this had not been so, for, on the contrary, he had made use of this expression while perfect silence prevailed, and before the noise (caused by his utterance) had arisen. Asked by Florentius to state their opinion, the two bishops, Thalassius of Caesarea and Eusebius of Ancyra (neither of whom had been present at the Synod of the year 448), declared that the representatives of Eutyches could not confirm one part of what he had deposed and not the other; but all that he said must be confirmed and regarded as

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 753-771; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 171-182.

Eutyches' own explanation. Constantine replied that he had not claimed to have received such extensive authority from Eutyches; but Florentius pointed out that it had been so stated by himself in the Acts. Bishop Meliphthongus of Juliopolis interposed the remark that it was now clear that they ought to have accepted his proposal, that Eutyches should again be heard in person. But again he found no response, and at the request of the Patrician the two earlier synodal deputies, the priest John and the deacon Andrew, declared most solemnly that Eutyches had certainly spoken the words in question to them. Upon the further remark of the monk Constantine, that the earlier report of the presbyter John had not yet been read from the minutes, the latter himself requested that this should now be done, and that he should put off taking the oath until the reading was completed.

After this the whole of the testimony which had been borne by John in the third session at Constantinople (see p. 191 f.) was now read from beginning to end, and after this was done, John remarked that, as they knew, it was not quite possible to repeat the very words which one had heard; but the deacon Andrew and the deacon Athanasius (of Seleucia) had also been present at the interview with Eutyches. Besides, he had immediately at the time made a note in writing of what he had heard, and still possessed this memorandum. At the request of Florentius it was read,¹ and it agreed in every essential with the minute (of the Synod of Constantinople). For this reason Constantine, the friend of Eutyches, made no criticism; but his colleague Eleusinius called attention to the fact that the supposed expression of Eutyches which stood in the minutes of the Synod: "Christ's body is not of one substance with ours," was not found in the memorandum of John. John replied that he would swear that Eutyches had actually spoken these words, but to him alone, and not also to the others who were present, for which reason he had not put them in his memorandum.

Then the short testimony which the deacon Andrew had given in the third session at Constantinople (p. 192) was read, and he added to this that the priest John had then asked

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 782 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 187.

Eutyches whether he acknowledged that Christ, in His Godhead, was of one substance with the Father, but in His manhood of one substance with us. Eutyches had replied that the Creed (of Nicæa) spoke only of one consubstantiality, namely that of the Godhead, and we ought to be satisfied with that. Moreover, Eutyches had spoken something with John alone, which he had not heard. The same was deposed by the deacon Athanasius of Seleucia, only he knew nothing of the separate conversation between Eutyches and John. The monk Eleusinius, one of the agents of Eutyches, laid great stress upon the fact that John in his later testimony had added something to his first memorandum in his notebook, and both reports were then read again and compared. Athanasius explained that when in the third session of Constantinople the words of Eutyches, "not of one substance with us after the flesh," were read, he had remarked that this was new to him; but the priest John had then again asseverated that Eutyches had uttered this in his presence alone. John now said the others, however, must have heard how he addressed the question to Eutyches: "Dost thou believe that the Son, as touching the Godhead, is of one substance with the Father, and as touching the manhood of one substance with us?" and they testified to this.¹

Then this point was left, and they proceeded with the reading of the Acts of Constantinople. At those of the fifth session the monk Constantine at the beginning tried to create a doubt as to whether Eutyches had really said to the Archimandrite Martin, that "if they (the other archimandrites) did not make common cause with him, the Archbishop would ruin them all, like him" (p. 196). He and his colleague Eleusinius, however, immediately gave up the demand for further examination of this point, which they themselves acknowledged to be unimportant.

After the reading of the minutes of the sixth session, at the request of Constantine, the synodal deputy Theophilus, who had previously been sent to Eutyches, was examined anew on the words which Eutyches had then spoken to him (p. 198). In his new testimony he added that Eutyches had then also

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 771-791; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 181-193.

said: "I follow the explanations of the Fathers," and the agents of Eutyches laid great stress upon this. Then Mamas, who had formerly been sent with Theophilus to Eutyches, repeated what he had said then, and, after a brief interposition from Constantine, they passed on to the minutes of the seventh session.¹ The first doubt on this occasion was raised by Florentius, who remarked: "he had indeed said that they should ask Eutyches how he believed and taught;" but the words further ascribed to him, "why he expressed himself differently at different times (p. 201), he had not added." Archbishop Flavian asked who had made this (otherwise very unimportant) addition; but the notary Actius thought it was not yet shown that it really was a *foreign* addition, and Florentius allowed the point to drop.

On the further reading Eleusinius maintained that everything was not set forth in its proper order, particularly that Eutyches had at the very beginning offered to hand in the paper mentioned in the minutes, which had contained the Creed of Nicæa, but which had not been accepted by Flavian. The latter asked, in reply, how it was certain that the Nicene Creed had really formed part of that paper; and Eusebius of Dorylæum wished to remove this whole point with the proposal that the chief question, whether Eutyches were really a heretic or not, should be left to the Œcumenical Council which was already summoned. But Bishop Seleucus of Amasia remarked, with great force, that Eutyches, in his letter to Pope Leo, said that the paper which he proffered to the Synod had contained an appeal to Rome: how could he then maintain that its contents was a confession of faith? he contradicted himself. After the further remark of Florentius, that Eutyches had, after the conclusion of the Synod of Constantinople, handed in that paper to him, they continued the reading of the minutes of the seventh session, and after a little Eleusinius maintained that the words of Eutyches were omitted, in which he said that "he thought exactly as the Synods of Nicæa and Ephesus had taught." But the bishops testified in great numbers that Eutyches had not then, at least, spoken these words. On further reading, Eleusinius raised a doubt as to whether, at the point at which it stood in the Acts, "the

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 791-798; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 195.

Synod rose up and cried," etc. (p. 203), the first anathema had been pronounced upon Eutyches. Florentius and several bishops could no longer remember this; others affirmed that they had so exclaimed; but the notary Aetius remarked that it might easily happen, and without any bad intention, that if several bishops cried out the same thing (and no one contradicted), this should be taken for the utterance of the Synod. And so it might have happened here. This point also was then passed over; but at the next section of the minutes Florentius remarked that he had spoken to Eutyches the words: "Dost thou acknowledge two natures, etc., and if not, thou wilt be condemned" (p. 203), not as a threat, but as an exhortation, in order to induce him to submit to the Synod. A further expression, however, attributed to him: "He who does not say 'of two natures,' has not the right faith" (p. 203), was not his, and he should not have been justified, as a layman, in thus speaking.¹ The notary Aetius appealed, however, to the testimony of the bishops and officers of state, in whose presence the Acts had been examined and approved after they were drawn up. Florentius might, perhaps, object that he at least had not read these Acts all through; but it was incomparably more probable that Florentius had learnt in the interval that the expression which he now wished to disavow was not in accordance with court-orthodoxy, than that the Acts should have been falsified at this place.

At the conclusion of the minutes of the Synod, Constantine had several points to represent, and first of all that the cause of the condemnation of Eutyches was not expressed with sufficient exactness, for this had followed when, in answer to the demand of Flavian that he should pronounce an anathema on all who did not acknowledge two natures, he had replied: "Woe is me if I should anathematize the holy Fathers."² This was wanting in the Acts. (Certainly; but it appears in them somewhat earlier, and was objected to by the agents of Eutyches at that earlier place. The whole error then, if there was one, consists in a transposition which was made without the least purpose of deception.)

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 810; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 203.

² Mansi, *l.c.* p. 811; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 203.

Constantine further noted the omission of several insignificant details at the close of the seventh session, particularly several expressions of some of the bishops, and the notice that Archbishop Flavian had wished to have another passage read from S. Athanasius on the question of one or two natures, but that his notary Asterius, without regarding this, had immediately published the sentence against Eutyches. On this Aetius and several bishops remarked that there had been such loud speaking at the close of that session that they might easily have failed to hear the one expression or the other. Besides, several of them said they could no longer remember particular details.¹ During the proceedings on this subject Constantine asserted that the judgment on Eutyches which stood in the Acts had not been conceived first at the session, but had been previously dictated by the Archbishop. Aetius demanded that Constantine should tell them how he knew this; but Bishop Seleucus put the point aside as not belonging to the question, since the matter now before them was the alleged falsification of the Acts, and not the time at which the Archbishop had conceived the idea of the sentence on Eutyches.²

Finally, the monk Constantine again made the assertion that during the reading of the judgment pronounced upon him, Eutyches had appealed to a council of the Bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Thessalonica (the primatial see of Illyria Orientalis), but that the minutes were silent on this subject. That this assertion was scarcely correct is clear from that which the imperial commissioner Florentius was able to say on the subject, namely, that Eutyches, *after the Council was already dissolved*, had said to him *quietly* that he appealed to a Roman, Egyptian, and Jerusalemite Council.³ He (Florentius) had immediately made Archbishop Flavian acquainted with this. Bishop Basil of Seleucia asserted that Eutyches had said, during the proceedings of the Synod, that he would acknowledge the two natures if the Bishops of Rome and Alexandria required this of him; but he had heard nothing of an appeal. Flavian, too, testified that he had not

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 811-814; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 203 sqq.

² Mansi, l.c. p. 814 sqq.; Hardouin, l.c. p. 206.

³ Mansi, l.c. p. 817; Hardouin, l.c. p. 208.

heard a word from Eutyches himself on the subject of an appeal, and that it was only *after* the close of the Synod that Florentius had given the intimation referred to. The same testimony, that they had heard nothing of an appeal, was given by all the other bishops. At the close, Florentius requested that these new proceedings should also be laid before the Emperor. He promised, in like manner, to bring to the knowledge of the Emperor the declarations of the notaries of Flavian that they had justified themselves, and that no one raised any complaint against them, so that in the future, when they no longer had the Acts at hand, they should not again be called to account.¹

As we have already seen, the monk Constantine had maintained in the assembly just described, of the 13th of April, that the sentence of deposition on Eutyches was not first drawn up at the seventh session of the Synod, but had been previously dictated by Flavian. This point had not then been entered upon. Notwithstanding, Eutyches did not allow this to pass, and at his request the Emperor appointed a new small commission of inquiry, which met on the 27th of April 449. The imperial Count Martial was its president, the Count Castorius his assistant, the tribune Macedonius and the Silentiarius Magnus, of whom we have already spoken, had to be examined. First the petition was read which Eutyches had addressed to the Emperor on this subject, and as he appealed in it also to the Silentiarius Magnus, who had conducted him into the presence of the Synod, and had then seen and heard something in reference to the sentence in question, the Silentiarius was now required by Martial to give evidence of the truth. He deposed that, when he had come to Archbishop Flavian to announce to him that the Patrician Florentius would be present at the Synod by the Emperor's commission, the Archbishop had said to him that it was unnecessary to trouble so distinguished a personage on this occasion, for the pattern in this matter (*i.e.* the sentence) was already given, and Eutyches was already condemned, because he had not appeared at the second invitation. He had also been shown a paper containing this condemnation, and this had been done before the Synod

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 817-822; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 208 sq.

had pronounced its judgment.¹—This testimony was entered in the minutes, and then, at the request of the monk Constantine, Macedonius was desired to give an account of what he had heard from the priest Asterius, Flavian's notary. He declared that after the close of the previously mentioned session for the confirmation of the Acts, Asterius had informed him that the Archimandrite Abraham and the notaries had falsified the Acts. This also was entered in the minutes,² but no inquiry was made into the accuracy of this testimony, as it must have appeared, *à priori*, improbable that Asterius, one of the notaries of Flavian, who was thoroughly devoted to him, and who was himself implicated, should have betrayed himself and his colleagues.

¹ Fuchs, in his *Biblioth. der Kirchenvers.* Bd. iv. S. 398, says on this point: "That Flavian was interrogated on the subject is not said. Probably he would not have found it difficult to defend himself, for the whole circumstance could prove nothing against the legality of the proceedings against Eutyches. . . . As Eutyches had not appeared after two citations, it could hardly have been hoped that he would appear at the third. In this case he must have been condemned; and why should not Flavian in that case have prepared the judgment beforehand?"

² Mansi, t. vi. pp. 821-828; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 209-213.

CHAPTER III.

THE ROBBER-SYNOD.

SEC. 175. *Convocation of the Synod.*

A FEW weeks before those two commissions of inquiry met, the Emperor Theodosius II. had summoned an Œcumenical Council to Ephesus. He did this at the united request of Eutyches and the Patriarch Dioscurus of Alexandria,¹ supported probably by the minister Chrysaphius. Dioscurus stood on the same doctrinal ground as Eutyches, understanding the teaching of Cyril in the same sense as he did, and discovered Nestorianism in every other view. He was perhaps also drawn on by envy against the Patriarch of Constantinople, whose see began to obtain precedence over that of Alexandria, a circumstance which, half a century before, had occasioned the irreconcilable hatred of Theophilus of Alexandria against S. Chrysostom. Dioscurus now went so far that, in opposition to all canonical laws, he received back Eutyches into the communion of the Church, and declared him to be restored to his dignities as priest and archimandrite even before the greater Synod of Ephesus, which had been called for the examination of the subject, had given a decision upon it; and this although Eutyches had been excommunicated by a competent tribunal, and although Dioscurus had not the least jurisdiction over him.²

Of the convocation of this Synod, as imminent, Flavian had spoken in his second letter to Pope Leo, and frequently de-

¹ Liberat. *Breviar. Hist. Eutych.* c. 12, in Galland. *Biblioth. PP.* t. xii. p. 140; and Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ad ann. 5940, t. i. p. 154, ed. Bonn. (*alias*, p. 86). Pagi contends that the Empress Eudocia had also interceded for Eutyches, *Crit. ad ann.* 449 n. 7 (on account of the absence of the Empress at the time), and after him, Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. vi. S. 200, Anm.

² Mansi, t. vi. pp. 1045 and 1099; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 345 and 379.

clared that he expected no good of it (see above, p. 210). Bishop Eusebius of Dorylæum, on the contrary, seems to have regarded the prospect as more favourable, as we may infer from his expressions already mentioned (p. 216). The imperial brief of convocation itself, which, as was usual, was sent forth in the name of the two Emperors, Theodosius II. and Valentinian III., is dated from Constantinople on the 30th of March 449. It was addressed in identical terms to the great metropolitans, and still exists in the copy sent to Dioscurus. The Emperors declare in it their zeal for orthodoxy, and explain that, as doubts and controversies have arisen respecting the right faith, the holding of an Œcumenical Synod has become necessary. Dioscurus must therefore, with ten of the metropolitans subject to him and ten other holy bishops distinguished for knowledge and character, present themselves at Ephesus, on the approaching first of August. The same invitations were sent also to the other bishops, and they were warned that none of those who were summoned could, without great responsibility, decline or delay their arrival. Theodoret of Cyrus, on the contrary (the strenuous opponent of Monophysitism), was not to appear unless the Synod itself should summon him.¹

In a second letter to Dioscurus, dated the 15th of May of the same year, the Emperor says he has learned that many Oriental archimandrites were with great zeal opposing some Nestorianizing bishops; he had therefore given command that the Priest and Archimandrite Barsumas (of Syria) should also appear as representative of all his colleagues at the Council of Ephesus with a seat and a vote, and Dioscurus is required to receive him in a friendly manner as a member of the Synod.²

¹ In Mansi, t. vi. p. 588 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 71. German in Fuchs, *Biblioth. der Kirchenvers.* Bd. iv. S. 335. That Ibas had been exiled by the minister Chrysaphius, at the request of Eutyches, in order to keep him at a distance from the Synod, is asserted by Liberatus in his *Breviar.* c. 12, in Galland. *Bibl. PP.* t. xii. p. 140. It appears, however, that this banishment really took place after the Robber-Synod. Cf. Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. vi. S. 204.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 593; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 76. This Monophysite abbot, Barsumas (a Saint of the Jacobites), must not be confounded with the contemporaneous Nestorian bishop, Barsumas of Nisibis. Cf. on both, the *Kirchenlexicon* of Wetzer and Welte, under the article "Barsumas."

With this agrees the letter of the Emperor to Barsumas himself, dated on the 14th of May, which has also come down to us;¹ and therefore we may suppose that in fact some Nestorianizing bishops in the East had been raising controversies at the same time with Eutyches, only in a directly opposite manner, and that this was, in the Emperor's view, a second reason for the convocation of the Synod. About the same time the Emperor appointed two high officers of state, Elpidius (*Comes sacri consistorii*, as he is called in the letter to the proconsul Proclus) and the tribune and prætorian notary Eulogius, as his commissioners at the approaching Synod, and gave them written instructions (*commonitorium*) which still exist in the copy addressed to Elpidius, and run as follows: "But lately the holy Synod of Ephesus had been engaged with the affair of the impious Nestorius, and had pronounced a righteous sentence on him. Because, however, new controversies of faith had arisen, he had summoned a second Synod to Ephesus, in order to destroy the evil to the roots. He had therefore selected Elpidius and Eulogius for the service of the faith in order to fulfil his commands in reference to the Synod of Ephesus. In particular, they must allow no disturbances, and they must arrest every one who aroused such, and inform the Emperor of him; they must take care that everything is done in order, must be present at the decisions (*κρίσει*), and take care that the Synod examine the matter quickly and carefully, and give information of the same to the Emperor. Those bishops who previously sat in judgment on Eutyches (at Constantinople) are to be present at the proceedings at Ephesus, but are not to vote, since their own previous sentence must be examined anew. Further, no other question is to be brought forward at the Synod, and especially no question of money, before the settlement of the question of faith. By a letter to the proconsul he had required support for the commissioners from the civil and military authorities, so that they might be able to fulfil his commissions, which were as far above other business as divine above human things."²

A short decree to the proconsul Proclus of Asia acquainted

¹ Mansi and Hardouin, *ll. cc.*

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 596; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 75.

him with the imperial resolution thus expressed, and ordered him to support the commissioners as well as possible, otherwise he would expose himself to great responsibility.¹

We possess, besides, two other imperial decrees which preceded the actual opening of the Ephesine or Robber-Synod. The first of them is an edict to Dioscurus, to the effect that "the Emperor has already forbidden Theodoret of Cyrus, on account of his writings against Cyril, to take part in the Synod, unless he is expressly summoned by the Synod itself. Because, however, it was to be feared that some Nestorianizing bishops would use every means in order to bring him with them, the Emperor, following the rule of the holy Fathers, would nominate Dioscurus to be president of the Synod."² Archbishop Juvenal of Jerusalem and Thalassius of Casarea, and all zealous friends of the orthodox faith, would support Dioscurus. In conclusion, the Emperor expresses the wish that all who should desire to add anything to the Nicene Confession of Faith (*Symbolum*), or take anything from it, should not be regarded in the Synod; but on this point Dioscurus should give judgment, since it was for this very purpose that the Synod was convoked."³

The second rescript, addressed to the Synod itself, says: "The Emperor had indeed wished that all had remained at rest, and that he had not found it necessary to trouble the bishops; but Flavian had brought into question some points respecting the faith, in opposition to the Archimandrite Eutyches, and on that account had assembled a council. The Emperor had several times entreated him to allay again the storm which had been raised, so that the confusion might not become universal; but Flavian had not allowed the controversy to drop, and therefore the Emperor had judged necessary the opening of a holy Synod of the bishops of all parts, so that they might learn what had already been done in this matter, that they might cut off this controversy and

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 597; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 77.

² On the presidency at Ephesus, cf. vol. i. p. 43. Dioscurus said afterwards, at the Council of Chalcedon, that Juvenal and Thalassius had presided in common with him, which Natalis Alexander calls a falsehood. It is also contradicted by the contents of the imperial edict quoted above.

³ Mansi, t. vi. p. 600; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 80; Fuchs, l.c. S. 341.

all its diabolical roots, exclude the adherents of Nestorius from the Church, and preserve the orthodox faith firm and unshaken, since the whole hope of the Emperor and the power of the empire depended upon the right faith in God and the holy prayers of the Synod."¹

An invitation to take part in the Synod of Ephesus was also despatched to Pope Leo I., and reached Rome, May 13, 449.² The Pope, however, was unable to respond to the wish of the Emperor that he should appear *personally*, on account of disquieting conjunctures,³ and therefore he appointed three legates, Bishop Julius of Puzzuolo, the priest Renatus (Cardinal of S. Clement), and the deacon Hilarus, to take his place at the Synod, and to convey his letters to Archbishop Flavian, to the Emperor, to the Synod, to Pulcheria, etc.

SEC. 176. *The celebrated Epistola Dogmatica of Leo to Flavian.*

The first of these letters, to Flavian, contains that complete doctrinal treatise on the doctrine of the person of Christ which Leo had already (p. 210) promised to the bishop of Constantinople, and which afterwards, as approved by the fourth Œcumenical Synod, received symbolical importance.⁴

This letter, the original text of which we append in the note,⁵ with the omission of a few unimportant sentences, runs as follows:—"Chap. I. Thy letter, at the late despatch of

¹ Mansi, *l.c.* p. 589; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 77; Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 340.

² Cf. Leonis *Epist.* 31 *ad Pulcheriam*, c. 4, p. 856, ed. Baller. In Mansi, t. v. p. 1401.

³ *L.c.*, and *Ep.* 37, p. 886, ed. Baller. in Mansi, t. v. p. 1424.

⁴ This letter of Leo's, No. 28 in the collection of Ballerini, is printed in Leonis *Opp.* ed. Baller. t. i. pp. 801-838; in Mansi, t. v. p. 1366; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 290 sqq.; German in Fuchs, *l.c.* Bd. iv. S. 312 ff.; partially also in Arendt, *Leo d. G. u. seine Zeit*, Mainz 1835, S. 232 ff. The original text is Latin; the Greek translation printed with it was probably made immediately after its arrival in Constantinople, and read at the Synod of Chalcedon. Cf. Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. vi. S. 182 ff. Numerous notes to this letter are given by Quesnel and the Ballerini, and all printed together in the second volume of the ed. of the Ballerini, p. 1407 sqq. We remark that Gennadius, *De Viris illustr.* c. 84, says that many regard Prosper of Aquitaine as having conceived this letter; but he vindicates the authorship of Pope Leo himself.

⁵ *Leo episcopus dilectissimo fratri Flaviano constantinopolitano episcopo.*

Cap. I. Lectis dilectionis tuæ litteris, quas miramur fuisse tam seras, et

which I am astonished, and the synodal Acts which were appended, have at last made me acquainted with the offence which has arisen among you in opposition to the true faith. What has hitherto been dark has now become quite clear. Eutyches there shows himself as in a high degree ignorant and lacking in intelligence. . . . What knowledge of the Old and New Testament can he have who does not even understand the beginning of the creed? And that which the catechumens throughout the whole world confess, the heart of this old man cannot comprehend. — Chap. II. If He did not know what he ought to believe respecting the incarnation of the divine Word, and would not search throughout the whole Scriptures on the subject, then he ought to have adhered to the creed, which all know and confess: To believe in God, the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord, who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary. By these three propositions almost every heresy is overthrow'n. For, if one believes in God the Father Almighty, then is the Son declared to be co-eternal with Him, differing in nothing from the Father, because He is God of God, Almighty of the Almighty, Co-eternal of the Eternal, not later in time, not

gestorum episcopaliū ordine recensito, tandem quid apud vos scandali contra integritatem fidei exortum fuisset, agnovimus: et quæ prius videbantur occulta, nunc nobis reserata patuerunt. Quibus Eutyches, qui presbyterii nomine honorabilis videbatur, multum imprudens et nimis imperitus ostenditur, ut etiam de ipso dictum sit a propheta: *Noluit intelligere, ut bene ageret; iniquitatem meditatus est in cubili suo* (Ps. xxxv. 4). Quid autem iniquius, quam impia sapere, et sapientioribus doctioribusque non cedere? Sed in hanc insipientiam cadunt, qui cum ad cognoscendam veritatem aliquo impediuntur obscuro, non ad propheticas voces, non ad apostolicas litteras, nec ad evangelicas auctoritates, sed ad semetipsos recurrunt; et ideo magistri erroris existunt, quia veritatis discipuli non fuere. Quam enim eruditionem de sacris novi et veteris testamenti paginis acquisivit, qui ne ipsius quidem symboli initia comprehendit? Et quod per totum mundum omnium regenerandorum voce deponitur, istius adhuc senis corde non capitur.

C. II. Nesciens igitur quid deberet de Verbi Dei incarnatione sentire, nec volens ad promerendum intelligentiæ lumen in sanctarum Scripturarum latitudine laborare, illam saltem communem et indiscretam confessionem sollicito recepisset auditu, qua fidelium universitas profitetur credere se in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, et in Jesum Christum Filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum, qui natus est de Spiritu sancto et [ex?] Maria Virgine. Quibus tribus sententiis omnium fere hæreticorum machinæ destruantur. Cum enim Deus et omnipotens et [æternus] Pater creditur, consempiternus eidem Filius demonstratur, in nullo a Patre differens, quia de Deo Deus, de omnipotente omnipotens, de æterno natus

inferior in power, not unequal in glory, not divided in essence. And this only-begotten eternal Son of the eternal Father was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary. This birth in time has taken nothing from, and added nothing to, the eternal birth (from the Father), and its only end is the redemption of men. For we could not overcome sin and the author of death, unless our nature had been assumed and made His own by Him whom neither sin could stain nor death could hold. He was conceived by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin, and she bare Him without injury to her virginity, even as she conceived Him without loss of the same. If Eutyches in his own blindness cannot comprehend this, then he ought to have submitted to the utterances of Holy Scripture which treat of the incarnation of the Logos. He could not then have asserted that the Word had only so far become flesh, that Christ who was born of the womb of the Virgin had received

est coæternus; non posterior tempore, non inferior potestate, non dissimilis gloria, non divisus essentia: idem vero sempiterni genitoris unigenitus sempiternus natus est de Spiritu sancto et [ex ?] Maria Virgine. Que nativitas temporalis illi nativitati divinæ et sempiternæ nihil minuit, nihil contulit, sed totam se reparando homini, quierat deceptus, impendit; ut et mortem vinceret, et diabolum, qui mortis habebat imperium, sua virtute destrueret. Non enim superare possemus peccati et mortis auctorem, nisi naturam nostram ille susceperet, et suam faceret, quem nec peccatum contaminare, nec mors potuit detinere. Conceptus quippe est de Spiritu sancto intra uterum matris virginis, que illum ita salva virginitate edidit, quemadmodum salva virginitate concepit. Sed si de hoc Christianæ fidei fonte purissimo sincerum intellectum haurire non poterat, quia splendorem perspicuæ veritatis obacatione sibi propria tenebrarat, doctrinæ se evangelicæ subdidisset. Et dicente Matthæo: *Liber generationis Jesu Christi filii David, filii Abraham* (Matt. i. 1): apostolicæ quoque prædicationis expetisset instructum. Et legens in epistola ad Romanos: *Paulus servus Jesu Christi, vocatus apostolus, segregatus in Evangelium Dei, quod ante promiserat per prophetas suos in Scripturis sanctis de Filio suo, qui factus est ei ex semine David secundum carnem* (Rom. i. 1): ad propheticas [quoque], paginas piam sollicitudinem contulisset. Et inveniens promissionem Dei ad Abraham dicentis: *In semine tuo benedicentur omnes gentes* (Gen. xii. 3, xxii. 18): ne de hujus seminis proprietate dubitaret, secutus fuisset apostolum dicentem: *Abrahæ dictæ sunt promissiones, et semini ejus. Non dicit et seminibus, quasi in multis, sed quasi in uno, et semini tuo, quod est Christus* (Gal. iii. 16). Isaïæ quoque prædicationem interiore apprehendisset auditu dicentis: *Ecce virgo in utero accipiet, et pariet filium et vocabunt nomen ejus Emmanuel* (Isa. vii. 14), quod est interpretatum, *nobiscum Deus* (Matt. i. 23). Ejusdemque prophetæ fideliter verba legisset, *Puer natus est nobis, filius datus est nobis, cujus potestas super humerum ejus, et vocabunt nomen ejus magni consilii angelus, admirabilis, consiliarius, Deus fortis, Princeps pacis, Pater futuri seculi* (ix. 6). Nec frustratorie loquens, ita Verbum

the *form* of a man, but not a true body like His mother's. Perhaps Eutyches believed that Christ was not of the same nature with us, because the angel said to Mary: 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also the holy thing which is to be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.' He believed perhaps, because the conception of the Virgin was a divine work, that therefore the flesh of Him who was conceived was not of the nature of her who had conceived. But this is not so. The proper nature of the (human) race is not removed by the new mode of creation. The Holy Ghost gave fruitfulness to the Virgin, the truth of the body, however, comes from the body (of the mother). Therefore the evangelist says: 'The Word was made flesh,' that is, the wisdom of God has builded for Himself a house in that flesh which He assumed of a human being (Mary), and which He animated by the *spiritus animæ* [*vita?*] *rationalis* (by a reasonable soul).—Chap. III. Since, then, the properties of both natures and substances remained uninjured, and united in one person, lowliness was assumed by majesty, weakness by strength, mortality by eternity. In order to pay our debt, the inviolable nature was united to the passible, so that, as our salvation required, the one Mediator between God and man on the one side could die, on the other could

diceret carnem factum, ut editus utero virginis Christus haberet formam hominis, et non haberet materni corporis veritatem. An forte ideo putavit Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum non nostræ esse naturæ, quia missus ad beatam Mariam semper virginem angelus ait: *Spiritus sanctus superveniet in te, et virtus Altissimi obumbrabit tibi: ideoque et quod nascetur ex te sanctum, vocabitur Filius Dei?* (Luc. i. 35) ut quia conceptus Virginis divini fuit operis, non de natura concipientis fuerit caro concepti. Sed non ita[nobis] intelligenda est illa generatio singulariter mirabilis et mirabiliter singularis, ut per novitatem creationis proprietates remota sit generis. Fecunditatem enim virgini Spiritus sanctus dedit, veritas autem corporis sumpta de corpore est; et edificante sibi sapientia domum (Prov. ix. 1): *Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis* (Joan. i. 14): hoc est, in ea carne, quam assumpsit ex homine, et quam spiritu vite rationalis animavit.

C. III. Salva igitur proprietate utriusque naturæ et substantiæ, et in unam coeunte personam, suscepta est a majestate humilitas, a virtute infirmitas, ab æternitate mortalitas: et ad resolvendum conditionis nostræ debitum, natura inviolabilis naturæ est unita passibili: ut, quod nostris remediis congruebat, unus atque idem mediator Dei et hominum, homo Jesus Christus, et mori posset ex uno, et mori non posset ex altero. In integra ergo veri hominis perfectaque natura verus natus est Deus, totus in suis, totus in nostris. Nostra autem

not die. In the inviolate and perfect nature (*in integra perfectaque natura*) of a true man, true God is born, complete in His own (in His Godhead) and complete in ours (in the manhood). I say, 'in ours,' and I mean, as the Creator formed our nature, and as Christ wills to restore it (that is, Christ's manhood is the *integra*, not corrupted by sin). For of that which the tempter has brought into us there was in the Redeemer no trace. He participated in our infirmities, but not in our sins. He took upon Him the form of a servant without the stain of sin, and He raised the human without impairing the divine. The emptying of Himself (Phil. ii. 7), by which the Invisible showed Himself visible, and the Lord and Creator of the world willed to become one of the mortals, this emptying of Himself was no loss of power, but a working of compassion. He who in the form of God had made man, became man in the form of a servant. Each nature preserves its property inviolate, and as the 'form of God' did not annihilate the 'form of a servant,' so the form of a servant in nothing impairs the form of God (*forma Dei*).—Chap. IV. The Son of God, then, enters into this lower world, descending from His heavenly throne, and not receding from the glory of the Father, coming

dicimus, quæ in nobis ab initio Creator condidit, et quæ reparanda suscepit. Nam illa, quæ deceptor intulit, e thomo deceptus admisit, nullum habuerunt in Salvatore vestigium. Nec quia communionem humanarum subiit infirmitatum, ideo nostrorum fuit particeps delictorum. Assumpsit formam servi sine sorde peccati, humana augens, divina non minuens: quia exinanitio illa, qua se invisibilis visibilem præbuit, et Creator ac Dominus omnium rerum unus voluit esse mortalium, inclinatio fuit miserationis, non defectio potestatis. Proinde qui manens in forma Dei fecit hominem, idem in forma servi factus est homo. Tenet enim sine defectu proprietatem suam utraque natura: et sicut formam servi Dei forma non adimit, ita formam Dei servi forma non minuit. Nam quia gloriabatur diabolus, hominem sua fraude deceptum divinis caruisse muneribus, et immortalitatis dote nudatum duram mortis subiisse sententiam, seque in malis suis quoddam de prævaricatoris consortio invenisse solatium; Deum quoque, justitiæ exigente ratione, erga hominem, quem in tanto honore considerat, propriam mutasse sententiam; opus fuit secreti dispensatione consilii, ut incommutabilis Deus, cujus voluntas non potest sua benignitate privari, primam erga nos pietatis suæ dispositionem sacramento occultiore compleret; et homo diaboli iniquitatis versutia actus in culpam, contra Dei propositum non periret.

C. IV. Ingreditur ergo hæc mundi infima Filius Dei, de cælesti sede descendens, et a paterna gloria non recedens, novo ordine, nova nativitate generatus. Novo ordine, quia invisibilis in suis, visibilis factus est in nostris; incompre-

to the world in a new order of things, and in a new kind of birth. In a new order of things, since He who is in His own invisible, in ours (in our nature) has become visible, the incomprehensible willed to be comprehended, He who existed before all time began to be in time, the Lord of all veiling His majesty took upon Him the form of a servant, the impassible God does not disdain to be a suffering man, and the Immortal has subjected Himself to the laws of death. But it was by a new kind of birth that He came into the world, since the inviolate virginity, without experiencing concupiscence, furnished the matter of flesh. He assumed from His mother nature not guilt, and, as His birth is wonderful, so is His nature not unlike ours. For He who is true God is at the same time true man, and in this unity there is no lie, for the lowliness of man and the loftiness of God have penetrated each other (*invicem sunt*). As God is not changed by His compassion (*i.e.* since He became man out of compassion), so neither is man (the manhood) consumed (absorbed) by His dignity. Each of the two forms (natures) does in communion with the other that which is proper to it, since the Word (of God) performs that which is of the Word, and the flesh performs that which is of the flesh. The one of them shines forth in miracles, the other submits to insults. And as the Word does not recede from the equality of the Father's glory, so does the flesh not abandon the nature of our race. For He who is one and the same, as must be often repeated, is truly Son of God and truly Son

hensibilis voluit comprehendi, ante tempora manens esse cœpit ex tempore; universitatis Dominus servilem formam, obumbrata majestatis sue immensitate, suscepit; impassibilis Deus non dedignatus est homo esse passibilis, et immortalis mortis legibus subjacere. Nova autem nativitate generatus, quia inviolata virginitas concupiscentiam nescivit, carnis materiam ministravit. Assumpta est de matre Domini natura, non culpa; nec in Domino Jesu Christo, ex utero virginis genito, quia nativitas est mirabilis, ideo nostri est natura dissimilis. Qui enim verus est Deus, idem verus est homo; et nullum est in hac unitate mendacium, dum invicem sunt et humilitas hominis, et altitudo Deitatis. Sicut enim Deus non mutatur miseratione, ita homo non consumitur dignitate. Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione, quod proprium est; Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exsequente quod carnis est. Unum horum coruscat miraculis, aliud succumbit injuriis. Et sicut Verbum ab æqualitate paterne gloriæ non recedit, ita caro naturam nostri generis non relinquit. Unus enim idemque est, quod sæpe dicendum est, vere Dei Filius,

of man. *God* in this, that 'in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God;' *man* in this, that 'the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us;' *God* in this, that all things were made by Him, and without Him nothing was made; *man* in this, that He was made of a woman, and under the law. The birth of the *flesh* is the revelation of human nature; the being born of a virgin is the sign of divine power. The weakness of the child is shown by the lowliness of the cradle; the glory of the Highest is proclaimed by the voice of the angels. He is like to the beginnings of men (*rudimentis hominum*—that is, children) whom Herod wishes cruelly to slay; but He is Lord of all, whom the wise men rejoice humbly to adore. And that it might not be concealed that the Godhead is covered by the veil of the flesh, the voice of the Father called from heaven: 'This is my beloved Son,' etc. He who as man is tempted by the cunning of the devil, He, as God, is ministered to by angels. Hunger, thirst, weariness, and sleep are evidently human; but to feed five thousand men with five loaves, etc., to walk on the sea, to command the storms, is without doubt divine. As it does not belong to one and the same nature to bewail a dead friend with deep compassion, and to call him back to life

et vere hominis Filius. Deus per id, quod in principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum (Joan. i. 1); homo per id, quod Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis (ib. i. 14). Deus per id, quod omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil (ib. i. 3); homo per id, quod factus est ex muliere, factus sub lege (Gal. iv. 4). Nativitas carnis manifestatio est humane nature; partus virginis divine est virtutis indicium. Infantia parvuli ostenditur humilitate cunarum; magnitudo Altissimi declaratur vocibus angelorum. Similis est rudimentis hominum, quem Herodes impie molitur occidere; sed Dominus est omnium, quem magi gaudent suppliciter adorare. Jam cum ad præcursoris sui Joannis baptismum venit, ne lateret, quod carnis velamine divinitas tegetetur, vox Patris de cælo intonans dixit: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi bene complacui* (Matt. iii. 17). Quem itaque sicut hominem diabolica tentat astutia, eidem sicut Deo angelica famulantur officia (Matt. iv. 1). Esurire, sitire, lassescere atque dormire, evidenter humanum est. Sed quinque panibus quinque millia hominum satiare (Joan. vi. 5), et largiri Samaritanæ aquam vivam, cujus haustus bibenti præstet, ne ultra jam sitiat (Joan. iv. 10); supra dorsum maris plantis non desidentibus ambulare, et elationes fluctuum increpata tempestate consternere (Luc. viii. 24), sine ambiguitate divinum est. Sicut ergo, ut multa præteream, non ejusdem nature est, flere miserationis affectu amicum mortuum (Joan. xi.

when he has been four days dead by the mere command of His word, or to hang upon the cross and to make the elements tremble, etc.; so it does not belong to one and the same nature to say: 'I and the Father are one,' and 'the Father is greater than I.' For although in Jesus Christ there is only one person of God and man, yet the common glory and the common lowliness of the two natures have a different source. From us he has the manhood, which is inferior to the Father; from the Father He has the Godhead, which is equal to the Father.—Chap. V. For this reason that the two natures constitute only one person, we read that the Son of *man* came down from heaven (John iii. 13), while the Son of *God* took flesh of the Virgin; and also, that the Son of *God* was crucified and buried, while He suffered not in the Godhead, according to which He is the only-begotten, co-eternal and consubstantial with the Father, but in the weakness of the human nature. For this reason we say in the creed that the only-begotten Son of God was crucified and buried, in accordance with the words of the apostle: 'Had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory' (1 Cor. ii. 8). But when the Lord wished to instruct His disciples in the faith by questions, He said: 'Who do men say that I the Son of man am?' and on receiving diverse answers from them, He said: 'But who say

35), et eundem remoto quatruiduanae aggere sepulture, ad vocis imperium excitare redivivum (ib. v. 43), aut in ligno pendere, et in noctem luce conversa, omnia elementa tremefacere (Matt. xxvii. 45, 51); aut clavis transfixum esse, et paradisi portas fidei latronis aperire; ita non ejusdem nature est, dicere: *Ego et Pater unum sumus* (Joan. x. 30); et dicere: *Pater major me est* (Joan. xiv. 28). Quamvis enim in Domino Jesu Christo Dei et hominis una persona sit; aliud tamen est, unde in utroque communis est contumelia, aliud unde communis est gloria. De nostro enim illi est minor Patre humanitas; de Patre illi est æqualis cum Patre Divinitas.

C. V. Propter hanc ergo unitatem personæ in utraque natura intelligendam, et Filius hominis legitur descendisse de celo, cum Filius Dei carnem de ea virgine, de qua est natus, assumpserit. Et rursus, Filius Dei crucifixus dicitur ac sepultus, cum hæc non in divinitate ipsa, qua Unigenitus consempternus et consubstantialis est Patri, sed in naturæ humanæ sit infirmitate perpassus. Unde unigenitum Filium Dei crucifixum et sepultum omnes etiam in symbolo confitemur, secundum illud Apostoli: *Si enim cognovissent, nunquam Dominum majestatis crucifixissent* (1 Cor. ii. 8). Cum autem ipse Dominus noster atque Salvator fidem discipulorum suis interrogationibus erudiret, *Quem me*, inquit, *dicunt homines esse Filium hominis?* Cumque illi diversas aliorum opiniones

ye that I am,' that is, I, the Son of man? Peter, divinely inspired, and anticipating all nations with his confession, replied: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,' and thus confessed the Son of man as at the same time Son of God, because the one without the other could not have brought us salvation. . . . And after the resurrection of the true body (for it is no other which was raised than that which was crucified), what else happened in those forty days, but that our faith was cleared from all darkness? . . . He ate with His disciples, came through closed doors, imparted the Holy Ghost, and allowed them to touch His hands, etc., so that they might know that He possessed the properties of the divine and human natures undivided, and that we, without identifying the Word and the Flesh, should yet confess that the Word and the Flesh are one Son of God. This mystery of the faith was quite strange to Eutyches, who acknowledged our nature in the only-begotten Son of God, neither in the humiliation of mortality nor in the glory of the resurrection, and was not afraid of the saying of the

retexissent, *Vos autem, ait, quem me esse dicitis?* Me utique, qui sum Filius hominis, et quem in forma servi atque in veritate carnis aspiciatis, quem me esse dicitis? Ubi B. Petrus divinitus inspiratus, et confessione sua omnibus gentibus profuturus: *Tu es, inquit, Christus Filius Dei vivi* (Matt. xvi. 16). Nec immerito beatus est pronunciatus a Domino, et a principali petra soliditatem et virtutis traxit et nominis, qui per revelationem Patris eundem et Dei Filium est confessus et Christum: quia unum horum sine alio receptum non proderat ad salutem, et aequalis erat periculi, Dominum Jesum Christum aut Deum tantummodo sine homine, aut sine Deo solum hominem credidisse. Post resurrectionem vero Domini (quæ utique veri corporis fuit, quia non alter est resuscitatus, quam qui fuerat crucifixus et mortuus), quid aliud quadraginta dierum mora gestum est, quam ut fidei nostræ integritas ab omni caligine mundaretur? Colloquens enim cum discipulis suis, et cohabitans atque convescens, et pertractari se diligenti curiosoque contactu ab eis, quos dubietas perstringebat, admittens, ideo et clausis ad discipulos januis introibat, et flatu suo dabat Spiritum sanctum, et donato intelligentiæ lumine, sanctarum Scripturarum occulta pandebat; et rursus idem vulnus lateris, fixuras clavorum, et omnia recentissimæ passionis signa monstrabat, dicens: *Videte manus meas et pedes, quia ego sum. Palpate et videte, quia spiritus carnem et ossa non habet, sicut me videtis habere* (Luc. xxiv. 39); ut agnosceretur in eo proprietas divini humaneque naturæ individua permanere; et ita sciremus Verbum non hoc esse quod carnem, ut unum Dei Filium et Verbum confiteremur et carnem. Que fidei sacramento Eutyches iste nimium æstimandus est vacuus, qui naturam nostram in Unigenito Dei, nec per humilitatem mortalitatis, nec per gloriam resurrectionis agnovit. Nec sententiam beati Apostoli et evangelistæ Joannis

apostle: 'Every Spirit which looses (parts) Jesus is not of God, is Antichrist' (1 John iv. 3). [According to the Vulgate: *Omnis Spiritus qui solvit Jesum ex Deo non est; et hic est antichristus*: derived from the reading of the original, placed in the margin by the revisers and by Westcott and Hort, which substitutes λύει for μὴ ὁμολογεῖ.] But what is the meaning of 'loosing' Jesus but separating the human nature from Him? But he who is thus in darkness as to the nature of the body of Christ must also, in like blindness, teach foolishly in reference to His sufferings. For he who does not regard the cross of Christ as false, but holds that His death was real, must also acknowledge the flesh (the true manhood) of Him in whose death he believes. He cannot deny that the man whom he acknowledges as passible was of our body (that is, had a body of the same substance with ours); for the denial of the true flesh is also a denial of the bodily suffering. If he then confesses the Christian faith, he can also see what nature, pierced by nails, hung upon the wood of the cross; he may know whence (from what nature) blood and water flowed when the side of the crucified One was

expavit dicentis: *Omnis spiritus, qui confiletur Jesum Christum in carne venisse, ex Deo est: et omnis spiritus, qui solvit Jesum, ex Deo non est; et hic est antichristus* (1 Joan. iv. 2, 3). Quid autem est solvere Jesum, nisi humanam ab eo separare naturam, et sacramentum [fidei], per quod unum salvati sumus, impudentissimis evacuare figmentis? Caligans vero circa naturam corporis Christi, necesse est ut etiam in passione ejus eadem obsecratione desipiat. Nam si crucem Domini non putat falsam, et susceptum pro mundi salute supplicium verum fuisse non dubitat, cujus credit mortem, agnoscat et carnem; nec diffiteatur nostri corporis hominem, quem cognoscit fuisse passibilem; quoniam negatio veræ carnis, negatio est etiam corporeæ passionis. Si ergo christianam suscepit fidem, et a predicatione Evangelii suum non avertit auditum, videat, quæ natura transfixa clavis pependerit in crucis ligno, et aperto per militis lanceam latere crucifixi, intelligat, unde sanguis et aqua fluxerit, ut Ecclesia Dei et lavacro rigaretur et poculo. Audiat et beatum Petrum apostolum prædicantem, quod sanctificatio Spiritus per aspersionem fiat sanguinis Christi. Nec transitorie legat ejusdem apostoli verba dicentis: *Scientes, quod non corruptibilibus argento et auro redempti estis de vana vestra conversatione paternæ traditionis, sed pretioso sanguine quasi agni incontaminati et immaculati Jesu Christi* (1 Pet. i. 18). Beati quoque Joannis apostoli testimonio non resistat dicentis: *Et sanguis Jesu Filii Dei emundat nos ab omni peccato* (1 Joan. i. 7). Et iterum: *Hæc est victoria, quæ vincit mundum, fides nostra* (1 Joan. v. 4). Et: *Quis est qui vincit mundum, nisi qui credit, quoniam Jesus est Filius Dei? Hic est qui venit per aquam et sanguinem, Jesus Christus; non in aqua solum, sed in aqua et sanguine. Et spiritus est, qui testificatur, quoniam*

pierced. . . . The Catholic Church lives and grows in the faith that in Christ Jesus there was neither manhood without true Godhead, nor the Godhead without true manhood.— Chap. VI. When Eutyches answered to your question: ‘I confess that our Lord *before* the union consisted of two natures, but *after* the union I confess only one nature,’ I wonder that such a foolish and blasphemous confession was allowed to pass, as though nothing offensive had been heard. The first proposition, that the only-begotten Son of God *before* the union had two natures, is as impious¹ as the other, that after the incarnation there was only one nature. In order that Eutyches may not suppose from your silence that his explanation was right, or at least tolerable, we exhort thee, beloved brother, that when through God’s mercy he comes to give satisfaction, the folly of the ignorant man may be cleansed from this pestilential opinion. As the acts shôw, he began in a praiseworthy manner to abandon his view, and under thine influence declared that he would confess what he had not hitherto confessed, and believe what he had not hitherto believed.

spiritus est veritas. Quia tres sunt, qui testimonium dant, spiritus, aqua et sanguis, et [hi] tres unum sunt (ib. v. 5 ss.). Spiritus utique sanctificationis, et sanguis redemptionis, et aqua baptismatis; quæ tria unum sunt et individua manent, nihilque eorum a sui connexionē sejungitur; quia catholica Ecclesia hac fide vivit, hac proficit, ut in Christo Jesu nec sine vera divinitate humanitas, nec sine vera credatur humanitate divinitas.

C. VI. Cum autem ad interlocutionem examinis vestri Eutyches responderit, dicens: “Confiteor ex duabus naturis fuisse Dominum nostrum ante adunationem; post adunationem vero unam naturam confiteor;” miror tam absurdam tamque perversam ejus professionem nulla judicantium increpatione reprehensam, et sermonem nimis insipientem nimisque blasphemum ita omissum, quasi nihil quod offenderet esset auditum, cum tam impie duarum naturarum ante incarnationem unigenitus Dei Filius fuisse dicatur, quam nefarie, postquam *Verbum caro factum est*, natura in eo singularis asseritur. Quod ne Eutyches ideo vel recte vel tolerabiliter æstimet dictum, quia nulla vestra est sententia confutatum, sollicitudinis tuæ diligentiam commonemus, frater carissime, ut si per inspirationem misericordiæ Dei ad satisfactionem causa perducitur, imprudentia hominis imperiti etiam ab hac sensus sui peste purgetur. Qui quidem, sicut gestorum ordo patefecit, bene cœperat a sua persuasionē discedere, cum vestra sententia coactatus profiteretur se dicere, quod ante non dixerat, et ei

¹ Cf. the 35th letter of Leo, where he says quite correctly: He who teaches this must assume that the human soul which Christ took was *before* the birth of Mary in heaven, which would be as erroneous as the teaching of Origen concerning the pre-existence of the soul.

As, however, he refused to anathematize the impious doctrine, your Fraternity perceived that he was persisting in his error, and was deserving of condemnation. If, however, he again manifests genuine penitence, and acknowledges the righteousness of the episcopal sentence, and condemns orally, and in writing, his false statements, then he should be treated gently. . . . In order, however, to bring this whole matter to the end desired, I send in my stead my brethren, the Bishop Julius and the priest Renatus, with my son, the deacon Hilarus, with whom I associate the notary Dulcitius, hoping that by God's assistance he who had erred may abjure his false opinion, and so may find salvation. May God preserve thee, dearest brother.—Given on the 13th of June, under the consuls Asturius and Protogenes". (A.D. 449).¹

fidei acquiescere, cujus prius fuisset alienus. Sed cum anathematizando impio dogmati noluisse præbere consensum, intellexit eum fraternitas vestra in sua manere perfidia, dignumque esse, qui iudicium condemnationis exciperet. De quo si fideliter atque utiliter dolet, et quam recte mota sit episcopalis auctoritas vel sero cognoscit, vel si ad satisfactionis plenitudinem omnia, quæ ab eo male sunt sensa, viva voce et præsentis subscriptione damnaverit, non erit reprehensibilis erga correctum quantacunque miseratio, quia Dominus noster verus et bonus pastor, qui *animam suam posuit pro ovibus suis* (Joan. x. 15), et qui venit animas hominum salvare, non perdere (Luc. ix. 56), imitatores nos suæ vult esse pietatis; ut peccantes quidem justitia coerceat, conversos autem misericordia non repellat. Tunc enim demum fructuosissime fides vera defenditur, quando etiam a sectatoribus suis opinio falsa damnatur. Ad omnem vero causam pie ac fideliter exsequendam, fratres nostros Julium Episcopum et Renatum Presbyterum Tituli sancti Clementis, sed et filium meum Hilarum Diaconum vice nostra direximus. Quibus Dulcitium Notarium nostrum, cujus fides nobis est [sepe] probata, sociavimus; confidentes adfuturum Divinitatis auxilium, ut is, qui erraverat, damnata sensus sui pravitate, salvetur. Deus te incolumem custodiat, frater carissime.—Data Idibus Junii, Asturio et Protogene viris clarissimis Consulibus.

¹ To this letter the Pope subsequently (after the Robber-Synod) added a number of patristic testimonies, Latin and Greek, for the confirmation of his teaching, and sent them by his legates, Bishops Abundius and Asterius, and the priests Basil and Senator, to Constantinople (cf. *Epist.* 71). This appendix was produced there *before* the Synod of Chalcedon (*Epist.* 88); but in the second session of Chalcedon itself, only Leo's letter was read, without the appendix. Cf. Ballerini edit. *Opp. S. Leonis*, t. i. p. 798 sq., and t. ii. p. 1425.

SEC. 177. *Subsequent Letters of Pope Leo the Great on account of Eutyches.*

On the same day Leo signed a series of other letters, which stand in still nearer relation to the council which had been summoned. This is especially the case with the letter to the Emperor Theodosius II. (dated June 13, 449). The Pope, in this letter, commends the Emperor's zeal for the faith, and asserts that the heresy of Eutyches is made quite clear by the Acts of the Synod of Constantinople. The foolish old man ought, therefore, without further delay, to abandon his view; as, however, the Emperor had invited a synodal judgment (*Synodale judicium*) at Ephesus, in order that the blind might see, he had commissioned his three legates to take his place there. If Eutyches should again come to a right judgment, and keep the promise which he had given in his letter to the Pope,—namely, to correct what he had erroneously asserted (p. 205),—then he ought again to be received with goodwill. As regarded the belief of the Catholic Church concerning the incarnation of Christ, Leo had completely explained this in his letter to Flavian, which he appended.¹

Another letter of the same date is addressed to the Empress Pulcheria, the sister (and co-regent) of the Emperor, and, together with a short commendation of this Princess, contains an explanation of the fact that Eutyches had certainly fallen into the error directly opposed to Nestorianism, and had obstinately adhered to it more from ignorance than from wickedness. Pulcheria should use her influence for the extirpation of this heresy. If Eutyches should repent, then he ought to be forgiven, on which point Leo had already written to Flavian, and had given his legates commission. For the rest, it would be better if Eutyches should again correct his error in the place in which he had taught erroneously,² and therefore in Constantinople, and not in Ephesus.

A second letter of Leo's to Pulcheria, the thirty-first in the collection of the Ballerini, bears in some of the manuscripts

¹ *Epist.* 29, in Baller. p. 839 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 15; Mansi, t. v. p. 1391.

² *Epist.* 30, p. 847, ed. Baller.; Mansi, t. v. p. 1398; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 18.

the date, "June 13, 449;" it seems, however, improbable that the Pope should have committed to his legates two letters for Pulcheria of the same date and with the same contents, and the Ballerini are therefore of opinion that this second and longer one was never despatched.¹ Walch even regards it as spurious.² The contrary is maintained by Arendt in his monograph on Leo the Great,³ namely, that the longer copy of the letter (*Epist.* 31) is the genuine, and the shorter (*Epist.* 30) is only an extract from it. However this may be, both the letters to Pulcheria have quite the same leading thoughts, the commendation of the Princess, and the assertion that Eutyches had through ignorance fallen into the opposite extreme from Nestorianism. The only difference is that, in the second letter, this point and the doctrinal element are brought out at greater length; besides, that in this there is a complaint that the interval before the time fixed for the opening of the Synod of Ephesus is so short that the necessary preparations can hardly be made, and that it is not possible for the Pope to appear in person.⁴

Leo further entrusted to his legates a letter to all the archimandrites of Constantinople, also dated June 13, saying that he is convinced that they do not agree with the error of Eutyches. If Eutyches did not recant, then he would be properly expelled from the Church. If, on the contrary, he should acknowledge and condemn his error, then their mercy should not be withheld. The true doctrine of the Church on the existing controversy might be seen from the papal letter to Flavian.⁵

For the approaching Synod, Leo had prepared the following letter: "The Emperor had wished from zeal for the orthodox faith that the influence of the apostolic see should second the effect of his edict (in regard to the convoking of the Synod),⁶

¹ S. Leonis *Opp.* ed. Baller. t. i. p. 846, n. 5; Mansi, t. v. p. 1395, n. 5.

² Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. vi. S. 189 f.

³ S. 483, n. 4.

⁴ *Epist.* 31, in Baller. p. 853; Mansi, t. v. p. 1401.

⁵ *Epist.* 32, in Baller. p. 859 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 15; Mansi, t. v. p. 1406.

⁶ The imperial edict calls Leo, in accordance with the official style of the period, a *dispositio sancta*, cf. the fourth note of the Ballerini on the text of our letter. We must not translate the words *dispositio sancta* "divine order," as in the *Katholik*, 1872, S. 132.

and that Peter himself, as it were, should declare what he meant by the words: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' If Eutyches had rightly understood this utterance, he would not have gone aside from the way of truth. On account of this answer of Peter, Christ had replied to him: 'I say unto thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church,' etc. As, however, the Emperor wished to have a Synod, an *episcopale concilium*, that the error might be dispersed by a fuller judgment (*pleniori iudicio*), Leo had sent the Bishop Julius, the priest Renatus, and the deacon Hilarius, together with the notary Dulcitus, who should be present as his representatives at the holy assembly, and in common with the bishops should draw up a decree which should be pleasing to God. First, the pestilential error should be anathematized, and then they should consider the restitution of Eutyches, in case he recanted. As to the dogma, Leo had thoroughly explained himself in the letter to Flavian. "¹

The last of these letters, dated on the 13th of June, are the two to Bishop Julian of Cos, of which the one appears to have been entrusted to the papal legates, the other to Julian's own emissary, the deacon Basil.² Bishop Julian had been a member of the Synod of Constantinople which condemned Eutyches, and had on this occasion written a letter to Leo, which is now lost. The Pope commends his orthodoxy, and remarks that since the transmission of the Acts of the Synod he is convinced of the heresy of Eutyches. To the approaching Synod he has appointed three legates, and in the letter to Flavian he has expressed himself at large on the dogma. In case Eutyches should repent, they ought to be merciful to him.³ In the other letter to Julian, Leo explains briefly the orthodox doctrine, and refers to the more complete exposition of this matter in his letter to Flavian.⁴

A few days after Leo's legates had departed with this

¹ *Epist.* 33, in Baller. p. 863 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 19; Mansi, t. v. p. 1410.

² Cf. the *Admonitio* of the Ballerini, p. 874, n. 4.

³ *Epist.* 34, in Baller. p. 869 sq.; Mansi, t. v. p. 1413.

⁴ *Epist.* 35, in Baller. p. 875; Mansi, *l.c.* p. 1415; Arendt holds (*l.c.*) that these two letters (*Epp.* 34, 35) are only one, the contents of which have (by the copyist) been improperly separated.

letter,¹ a new opportunity of sending letters to the East presented itself to the Pope, and therefore, on the 20th of June 449, he addressed a few lines to Flavian, with the intelligence that the legates had now departed; adding that the Synod appointed by the Emperor was evidently not necessary.² He made the same statement in the letter which he despatched to the Emperor himself on the same day, and at the same time excused his own non-appearance by saying that the troublous times forbade him to leave the city of Rome, and, besides, Roman bishops had never been present in person at any of the earlier Synods.³ More than a month afterwards, on the 23d of July, Leo again addressed a short letter to Flavian in answer to a letter in the meantime received from him, commending his attitude, and exhorting him to gentleness towards Eutyches, if he should abandon his error.⁴ This was the last letter written by Leo on this subject before the opening of the Synod.

Like Flavian (p. 221 f.) and Pope Leo, Theodoret expected no good from the Synod which had been convoked. He expresses this in his letters to Bishop Irenæus of Tyre and to his patriarch, Domnus of Antioch, and recommends to the latter great caution in the selection of the bishops and clerics whom he should take with him to the Synod. We can see from the last letter that Theodoret recognized the peace concluded between Cyril and the Orientals, and was willing to maintain it uprightly, but he had not yet given up his doubts as to the anathematisms of Cyril, but still suspected them of Monophysitism, and lamented that all the bishops did not see the poison in them. Now he was afraid that Dioscurus would attempt to have these anathematisms, and therewith Monophysitism, sanctioned at the Synod.⁵

¹ In regard to the time, cf. note 3 of the Ballerini on *Ep.* 36, p. 385; in Mansi, t. v. p. 1423, note 3.

² *Epist.* 36, in Baller. p. 885; Mansi, t. v. p. 1423. Quesnel would maintain that Leo had wished for the Synod to be held in Italy, so that his influence in it might be increased. But this theory is quite fanciful. Cf. Walch, *l.c.* S. 210.

³ *Epist.* 37, in Baller. *l.c.* p. 886; Mansi, t. v. p. 1424.

⁴ *Epist.* 38, in Baller. *l.c.* p. 887; Mansi, t. v. p. 1425.

⁵ Theodoret, *Epist.* 16 and 112, *Opp.* t. iv. p. 1076 sqq. and p. 1183 sqq., ed. Schulze.

SEC. 178. *The Proceedings at the Robber-Synod, according to their own Acts.*

In accordance with the imperial command, a numerous body of bishops actually assembled in Ephesus at the beginning of the month of August 449, and that Synod began which, under the name of the Robber-Synod, *latrocinium Ephesinum*, or *σύνοδος ληστρική*, has attained to such a melancholy celebrity. Its Acts are preserved by their having been read over at the Œcumenical Synod of Chalcedon, and having thus been embodied in the minutes of that Synod.¹ According to this document, the Synod, often called *Ephesina II.*, was opened August 8, 449, in the church of S. Mary at Ephesus. Whether it lasted only one day, or several, is not indicated in the Acts. The principal proceedings, together with the deposition of Flavian, seem to have been completed in one day, a fact which is also asserted by the anonymous author of the *Breviculus Historiæ Eutychianistarum* (see below, p. 258); whilst on three subsequent days, and perhaps at three subsequent sessions, those depositions of several bishops, *e.g.* of Theodoret and Domnus, were pronounced, of which the Acts say nothing, but which we learn from other sources (see below, p. 256).

Among the members of the Synod, Dioscurus is first mentioned in the Acts; after him the papal legate Bishop Julius (here called Julianus),² next Juvenal of Jerusalem, Domnus of Antioch, and only *quinto loco* Flavian of Constantinople, although the second Œcumenical Synod had assigned to the Bishop of Constantinople the rank next after the Bishop of Rome.

The author of the *Breviculus Historiæ Eutychianistarum* gives the number of the bishops present at this council as

¹ A special dissertation in Latin on the *Synodus ληστρική* was put forth by Schurzleisch, at Leipzig 1699; but it is of no great value. We shall draw attention to the labours of Tillemont and Walch at the proper places.

² Further on him and the papal legates generally, see below, pp. 255 ff. and 257 ff. Quesnel considered that the legates whom the Pope sent to the Oriental councils, represented not the Pope merely, but the whole Western Church. Cf. on the other side, the Ballerini in their edition of the works of Leo, t. ii. p. 1175.

about three hundred and sixty;¹ the synodal Acts, however, give a far smaller number, and, in fact, at the beginning of the Synod they mention only a hundred and twenty-seven bishops and eight representatives of eight others; altogether one hundred and thirty-five, to whom *ultimo loco* are added the two Roman clerics, the deacon Hilarus and the notary Dulcitus.² So at the close of the Robber-Synod one hundred and thirty-five bishops subscribed, in part personally and in part by their representatives; upon which, however, it is to be remarked that here thirteen names appear which are wanting at the beginning of the Synod; and on the other hand, nine are wanting which are present at the beginning. Two of the bishops present had it added to their subscriptions that, as they could not write, they had been obliged to let others subscribe for them. These were Bishop Elias of Adrianople and Cajumas of Phœnus in Palestine.³ Of those, however, who had also been members of the Synod of Constantinople, and therefore had no right of voting at Ephesus, there were, so far as the subscriptions testify, besides Flavian of Constantinople, the following, Basil of Seleucia, Seleucus of Amasia, Æthericus of Smyrna, Longinus of Chersonesus, Meliphthongus of Juliopolis, Timotheus of Prinopolis, and Dorotheus of Neocæsarea, the last represented by the priest Longinus.

The proceedings of the Robber-Synod were opened by their first secretary (*Primicerius Notariorum*), the priest John, probably one of the clergy of Dioscurus, with the announcement: "The God-fearing Emperors have, from zeal for religion, convoked this assembly."⁴ Thereupon he read, at the command of Dioscurus, the imperial brief of convocation (see p. 222), and the two Roman legates, Julius and Hilarus, explained through their interpreter, Bishop Florentius of Sardis in Lydia, that Pope Leo had also been invited by the Emperor, but did not personally appear, because this had not happened at the Synod of Nicæa or the first of Ephesus; therefore he had sent his legates, and had given them charge of a letter to the Synod.

¹ In Sirmond. *Appendix Codicis Theodos.* p. 113.

² In Mansi, t. vi. p. 606 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 83 sqq.

³ In Mansi, t. vi. p. 927 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 269 sqq.

⁴ Mansi, t. vi. p. 612; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 85.

This papal brief¹ was, at the command of Dioscurus, received by the secretary John, but instead of reading it, he published the second letter which the Emperor had sent to Dioscurus in reference to Barsumas (see above, p. 222).²

Invited by Dioscurus, Elpidius, the first of the imperial commissioners, delivered a short discourse, saying: "The Nestorian heresy was now properly condemned, but new religious doubts had soon arisen, for the removal of which the present Synod had been arranged. He would immediately communicate what the Emperor had in this respect commissioned himself (and his colleagues) to perform; he would only first speak on one point. The Logos had on that day permitted the assembled bishops to give judgment upon Him (on His person and nature). If they confessed Him rightly, then He also would confess them before His heavenly Father. But those who should pervert the true doctrine would have to undergo a severe twofold judgment, that of God and that of the Emperor."³ Then Elpidius read the imperial *Commonitorium* addressed to him and Eulogius (p. 223), and the secretary John read the edict of the Emperor addressed to the Synod (p. 224).

Thalassius of Cæsarea, the legate of Julius, and the Count Elpidius now declared that, in accordance with the command of the Emperor, they should first consider the faith. Dioscurus interpreted this to mean, not that the faith itself should first be declared, for this the former holy Synods had already

¹ Arendt, in his Monograph on Leo (S. 242 and 483), and others speak quite unhesitatingly of the fact that the legate required the reading of *two* papal briefs (the letter to the Synod and the *Epistola dogmatica* to Flavian). The Greek text of the Acts, however, has with γράμματα also the word πιστολι in the singular, and thus speaks in the first place only of Leo's letter to the Synod. But in this Leo had appealed to his *Epistola dogmatica* to Flavian, and the reading of this was the chief wish of Leo and his legates. Schröckh (*Kirchen-gesch.* Thl. xviii. S. 461) asserts erroneously that the letter of Leo to the Synod, but not the *Epistola dogmatica*, was read. Neither of these writings was read.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 614 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 88. The injustice involved in this is also recognised by Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. vi. S. 254 f. In other respects the latter (*l.c.* S. 218) has misunderstood the text of our Acts. By *aliæ divine litteræ ad Dioscurum*, which John read out, must not be understood a second letter of Leo's, but an *Imperial* letter termed in law language *divinæ*. The correct view was seen already by Tillemont, *Mémoires*, etc., t. xv. p. 556.

³ Mansi, t. vi. p. 620; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 90 sq.

done, but rather that they were now to consider whether the newly-introduced statements agreed with the declarations of the Fathers or not. "Or will you," he cried, "alter the faith of the holy Fathers?" The assembled bishops are said to have answered: "Anathema to him who makes alterations in it: Anathema to him who ventures to discuss the faith;" but this cry (the latter part of it) was denied at the Synod of Chalcedon.

Dioscurus proceeded: "At Nicæa and at Ephesus the true faith has already been proclaimed, but although there have been *two* Synods, the faith is but *one*," and he invited the bishops to declare that men must simply abide by the definitions of faith of Nicæa and Ephesus. The assembled bishops are said again to have shouted approvingly: "No one dare add anything or take anything away . . . a great guardian of the faith is Dioscurus! . . . Anathema to him who still discusses the faith. . . . The Holy Ghost speaks by Dioscurus," etc.¹ All these exclamations were afterwards disavowed at Chalcedon, and it is very probable that only some bishops thus exclaimed, and that the notaries put these words into the mouth of the whole Synod. They were all simply in the service of Dioscurus and his friends, while the other bishops were not allowed to have any notaries, and the memoranda which their clerics nevertheless made were violently taken from them and destroyed.²

On the proposal of the Count Elpidius, Eutyches was now introduced into the Synod, that he might himself give testimony concerning his faith. He began by commending himself to the Holy Trinity, after which he uttered a short censure on the Synod of Constantinople (A.D. 448), and handed in a confession which the secretary John immediately read. In the introduction Eutyches says that even in his youth he had formed the intention of living in complete silence and retirement, but he had not attained to this good fortune, for he had been surrounded by the greatest dangers and plots, because, in accordance with the definitions of the former Synod at Ephesus, he had tolerated no innovation in the faith. Then

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 625; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 96.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 624 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 93; cf. below, § 179, p. 252.

he repeats the Nicene Creed, together with the annexed anathemas against Arius, and asserts that he had *always* thus believed. That to this faith, under penalty of excommunication, nothing should be added and nothing should be taken away from it, had been solemnly declared by the former Synod of Ephesus under the presidency of the holy Father Cyril, as might be seen from the copy of the Acts which Cyril himself had sent to him.¹ He had always regarded the holy Fathers as orthodox, and had anathematized all heresies, Manes, Valentinus, Apollinaris, Nestorius, all back to Simon Magus, and also those who say that the flesh of our Lord and God Jesus Christ came down from heaven.² Living in this faith he had been accused as a heretic by Eusebius of Dorylæum before Flavian and the other bishops. Flavian, the inseparable friend of Eusebius, had summoned him to answer to the accusation, but had assumed that Eutyches would not appear, and that he might then condemn him for disobedience. When, notwithstanding, he did appear before the Synod, Flavian had declared his presence to be superfluous, as he had already been condemned in consequence of his previous non-appearance. Neither had he received the confession which Eutyches wished to hand in, or allowed it to be read. Eutyches had at his request then orally given testimony to his faith, declaring that he held fast to the decrees of Nicæa and Ephesus. When they had further questioned him, he had asked for the holding of the present Synod, and had promised to obey it. Then they had suddenly published the judgment condemning him. When he left the assembly at Constantinople, he went in danger of his life, and Flavian had everywhere published the sentence against him; but he had prayed the Emperor to convoke a Synod, and now entreated the assembled fathers to declare how great wrong had been done him, and to punish his opponents.³ After the reading of this writing of Eutyches, Flavian demanded that his accuser, Eusebius of Dorylæum, should also be heard. But Elpidius replied that the Emperor

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 630 sq. ; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 97 sq.

² Mansi, l.c. p. 633 ; Hardouin, l.c. p. 100.

³ Mansi, l.c. p. 640 sqq. ; Hardouin, l.c. p. 102 sqq.

had commanded that they who had sat in judgment upon Eutyches at Constantinople should now themselves be judged. Eusebius of Dorylæum had already brought forward his accusation at Constantinople, and there had conquered; he must not now for the second time appear as accuser,¹ but it must be judged whether that first judgment was just. They must now pass on to that which had occurred in connection with the matter in question (that of Eutyches).

Dioscurus and many other bishops immediately expressed their agreement with this; but the papal legates demanded that Leo's letter should first be read. Eutyches objected that the legates were suspected by him, because they had stayed some time with Flavian, and had supped with him; he therefore requested that any unfairness on their part should not be allowed to turn to his disadvantage. Dioscurus decided, as president, in accordance with the opinions expressed by many bishops, that the Acts of the Synod of Constantinople must first be read, and not till then the letter of the Pope. The reading of the first was undertaken by the secretary John, and he received for this purpose one copy from Flavian and another from Eutyches.² The documents relating to the first session of Constantinople (see above, p. 190 f.) were listened to without interruption;³ at those of the second session, Bishop Eustathius of Berytus declared, after the reading of two letters of Cyril,⁴ that this holy father, on account of the misunderstanding of his words, had expressed himself more clearly in subsequent letters to Acacius of Melitene,

¹ Here there was obvious injustice. If one party, Eutyches, was allowed to speak, his opponent ought to have been heard also.

² Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 643-650; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 105-110.

³ In Mansi, *l.c.* p. 654; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 111. Mansi and Hardouin have here not always rightly indicated *ad marginem* to which Synod the particular sentences and exclamations belong, whether to that of Constantinople, to the Robber-Synod, or to that of Chalcedon, at which last, as we know, the Acts of the first two were read, so that now the minutes of the former Synods are contained in that of Chalcedon. The sentence on p. 654 in Mansi, and p. 111 in Hardouin: *Sancta Synodus dixit: Et hæc universalis Synodus sic sapit. Et post hæc voces sequentia libelli Eusebii*, evidently belongs to the Robber-Synod, while Hardouin ascribes it to the Council of Chalcedon. So Mansi attributes to the Council of Chalcedon the somewhat lengthy section: *Et magnus Athanasius etc.*, whilst it belongs to that of Constantinople.

⁴ Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 658-674; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 114-126.

Valerian of Iconium, and Succensus of Dioçæsarea (see pp. 140–144), and not on the side of belief in *two* natures, but in *one* nature of the incarnate God.¹ He wished also to remark that Cyril was more favourable to Eutyches than they had supposed at Constantinople; but he did not take the words of Cyril in their connection and in their true sense, and thereby gave occasion for subsequent discussions at the Synod of Chalcedon.

When, at the continuation of the reading of the Acts, the expression of Bishop Seleucus of Amasia was brought forward: "We confess two natures also after the incarnation," the Robber-Synod declared this to be Nestorian, and exclaimed: "There are many Nestoriuses," and "It was not the Bishop of Amasia, but he of Sinope."² The secretary John added, that it was clear from what had been read that the bishops at Constantinople had substituted another doctrine in the place of the Nicene faith which had been confirmed at Ephesus, and Bishop Olympius of Evazæ pronounced an anathema on such an innovation. Immediately upon this Bishop Æthericus of Smyrna declared that he had not said that which was entered in the Acts of Constantinople as his expression: the point was, however, unimportant, and Dioscurus therefore passed quickly over it; but Æthericus himself endeavoured afterwards to represent the matter differently at Chalcedon, and thereby showed himself to be both an ignorant and a fickle man.³ The remaining part of the Acts of the second

¹ Mansi, *l.c.* p. 675; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 126.

² Mansi, *l.c.* p. 686; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 134. Tillemont could not understand (*l.c.* 560) what the Robber-Synod meant by this interruption. We may suppose that they meant to say: "It was not the Bishop of Amasia (Seleucus) who said this at Constantinople, but the Bishop of Sinope," who was then called Antiochus, as we learn from the Acts of Chalcedon (Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 369 and 474; Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 571, 1085). But this Antiochus was certainly not present at the Synod of Constantinople, A.D. 448 (Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 167 sqq.; Mansi, *l.c.* p. 750 sqq.). Perhaps Basil was at an earlier period Bishop of Sinope, and had uncanonically exchanged this for the see of Amasia, which was now brought against him as a reproach by his opponents, as though they said: "He was never Bishop of Amasia, he is Bishop of Sinope."

³ Mansi, t. vi. p. 687 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 133 sq. Here, too, both in Mansi and in Hardouin, the indications as to the Synod to which each particular part belongs are often inaccurate. It should be: The words *ὁ θεοφιλέστατος ἱερίσκοπος Σατουρνῖος* το τὸν μέλλοντα αἰῶνα (in Mansi, *l.c.* p. 688; Hardouin, *l.c.*

session gave occasion for no remark, and in the same way those of the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth sessions (see p. 191 ff.) were read without interruption. At those of the seventh session, on the contrary, after the reading of the questions which Eusebius of Dorylæum had put to Eutyches (p. 199), the ill-will of the Robber-Synod found vent in the words: "Burn Eusebius," and "Anathema to every one who speaks of two natures *after* the Incarnation." "He who cannot shout this loud enough," added Dioscurus, "let him hold up his hand in token of his assent;" and the Synod shouted: "Let him who teaches two natures be anathema!"¹ That, however, it was only the Egyptians, and not the whole Synod, that thus exclaimed, came out in the first session at Chalcedon (see below, sec. 189). Soon afterwards Bishop John of Hephæstus remarked: "As long as Eutyches hesitated to appear before the Synod of Constantinople, they promised him every kindness, but afterwards they treated him in a very unfriendly manner." Dioscurus, however, induced the assembled bishops to give their solemn approval to the declaration of faith which Eutyches had made at Constantinople (see p. 198).² Again, this was done by the Egyptians alone, as was shown at Chalcedon. At the last Bishop Basil of Seleucia objected to the expression ascribed to him (p. 203) in the Acts: "If thou, Eutyches, dost not accept two natures even after the union, then thou teachest a mingling." He had said: "If thou speakest of only one nature after the union, and dost not add, *σεσαρκωμένην καὶ ἐν ἀνθρωπήσαςαν* (that is, one incarnate nature of the Logos; see above, pp. 4, 144, and 192), then thou teachest a mingling."³ Subsequently he explained at Chalcedon that it was only from excitement and anxiety that he had at Ephesus denied and altered his former words (see p. 253).

p. 133) belong to the Acts of the Synod of Constantinople. The further words: *Αἰτίριχος* to *ἀναγινώσκισθαι τὰ ἑξῆς*, to the Robber-Synod. That which follows: *Καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σχιδαρίου ἀνέγνω* (in Mansi, *l.c.* p. 689; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 136), to the Council of Chalcedon. In this manner alone is the matter intelligible.

¹ Mansi, *l.c.* p. 738; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 162.

² Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 739 and 743; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 163 and 166.

³ Mansi, *l.c.* p. 746 sq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 767.

After the whole of the Acts of Constantinople had been read, Eutyches declared that they were in several parts falsified, and demanded that the minutes of that commission should be read, which, at his complaint, had been summoned to examine the synodal Acts. The secretary John immediately read them through in their whole extent (p. 211 ff.) without any interruption.¹ The same was done with the Acts of that second commission which had to examine the complaint of Eutyches, that "Flavian had drawn up the sentence upon him beforehand" (p. 219). In order to justify his charge of a falsification of the Acts, Eutyches wished them to read a statement of the Silentiar Magnus bearing upon it (p. 219). Flavian replied that the charge was false, and when Dioscurus demanded that he should prove it, he replied: "They would not allow him to speak; the Acts of the second session of Constantinople were quite unfalsified, as Thalassius (p. 211) and others who were present knew, and had been examined in the presence of the Silentiar and others, and no falsification had been proved. Before God he had nothing to fear on account of these Acts, and he had never altered his faith (an allusion to Æthericus, Basil, and Seleucus)." Dioscurus and the bishops under his influence asserted, on the contrary, that Flavian had full liberty of speech; but the whole history of the Robber-Synod gives him the lie.²

Thereupon Dioscurus requested that they should individually declare their view as to whether Eutyches was orthodox, and what was to be decreed concerning him; and there were now no fewer than 114 votes given, declaring the doctrine of Eutyches to be orthodox, and demanding his restitution as abbot and priest.³ The beginning was made by Juvenal of Jerusalem and Domnus of Antioch, the close by Abbot Barsumas and Dioscurus, when the latter confirmed the votes of the others and added his own. Although the Emperor had forbidden those bishops to vote this time who had co-operated in the deposition of Eutyches, yet the votes of Æthericus,

¹ Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 753-822; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 171-210.

² Cf. Tillemont, *l.c.* p. 562; Mansi, *l.c.* p. 831 sq.

³ In Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 833-862; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 217-232. The old Latin translation of these votes is more complete than the present Greek text.

Seleucus of Amasia, and Basil of Seleucia were received, because they were *for* Eutyches.¹ Of the papal legates, on the contrary, no vote is found.

Upon this the secretary John informed them that the monks of the convent over which Eutyches presided had sent in a document. He read it, and it is that accusation against Flavian and his Synod from which we have already (see p. 207, note 4) made some extracts. They say: "They had left all earthly goods and taken refuge in the cloister, three hundred in number, and many of them had led the ascetic life for thirty years. Then Archbishop Flavian had laid hold on their archimandrite, and had condemned him, because he would not violate the Nicene faith, like Flavian, but, on the contrary, had held fast by the decrees of the first Synod of Ephesus. The Archbishop had then denied them all communion with their abbot, and forbidden that the affairs of the monastery should be administered by him, and even had gone so far as to deny them the celebration of the holy mysteries. In consequence of this they had now, for almost nine months, had no holy sacrifice upon their altars, and several had already died in this state of schism. They therefore prayed the Synod to restore to them Church communion, and to inflict a just punishment upon him who had so unjustly condemned them."² Only thirty-five monks had signed, the priest and monk Narses at their head, although the context speaks of the number of three hundred. Why the other two hundred and sixty-five did not also subscribe, the monks did not think good to explain.

Instead of entering upon the assertions of these monks, Dioscurus contented himself with questioning them on their faith; and as they declared that they were in full agreement with Eutyches, they were also absolved by the Synod, restored to their dignities (the priests among them), and brought back to the communion of the Church.³ Thereupon Dioscurus, for the instruction of his colleagues, gave order to read, from the Acts of the first Synod of Ephesus (A.D.

¹ Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 839, 845, 851; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 220, 223, 227.

² Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 861-867; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 233 sqq.

³ Mansi, *l.c.* p. 867 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 236 sqq.

431), what had been there established concerning the true faith, and the secretary John read the Acts of the sixth session of Ephesus,¹ which contain the Nicene Creed and a quantity of patristic and other passages, as well as many extracts from the writings of Nestorius, in proof that he was a heretic.²

After the reading was finished, Dioscurus said: "You have now heard that the first Synod of Ephesus threatens every one who teaches otherwise than the Nicene Creed, or makes alterations in it, and raises new or further questions. Every one must now give his opinion in writing as to whether those who, in their theological inquiries, go beyond the Nicene Creed, are to be punished or not." It is clear that he wanted to use this to make an attack upon Flavian and the Synod of Constantinople, since they, going beyond the Synod of Nicæa, had wished to introduce the expression "two natures."

Several bishops, Thalassius of Cæsarea first, declared immediately that whoever went beyond the Nicene Creed was not to be received as a Catholic. Others simply affirmed their assent to the faith of Nicæa and Ephesus, without any addition in regard to overstepping it, and this was done by the Roman legate, the deacon Hilarus, who at the same time again demanded the reading of the papal letter. But Dioscurus went on as though he had not heard this, saying, "As, then, the first Synod of Ephesus threatens every one who alters anything in the Nicene faith, it follows that Flavian of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorylæum must be deposed from their ecclesiastical dignity. I pronounce, therefore, their deposition, and every one of those present shall communicate his view of this matter. Moreover, he added, as a means of intimidation, everything will be brought to the knowledge of the Emperor." Flavian now found it necessary to enter an appeal.³ That two papal

¹ Not the fourth, as is erroneously stated by Mansi, *l.c.* p. 871.

² Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 871-902; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 237-254; cf. above, p. 70 f.

³ On this appeal, and the canonistic controversy connected with it, and its literature, cf. Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. vi. S. 257 ff. It is asked here whether Flavian appealed to another Œcumenical Council, or to Pope Leo, or to both.

legates were still present at that time, and both protested against the proceedings of Dioscurus, and accepted the appeal of Flavian, is stated by Pope Leo in his 44th letter; the other members of the Synod, on the contrary, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Domnus of Antioch, and Thalassius at their head, declared Flavian and Eusebius guilty, a hundred of them voting under influence, among them again those who had been present at the Synod of Constantinople, Æthericus, Basil, and Seleucus. At the close, the 135 bishops who were present subscribed, some personally, some by representatives, with the abbot Barsumas.¹

So far the minutes of the Robber-Synod take us, thus giving us the testimony of the Synod concerning themselves. In order, however, to gain a complete and true picture of this assembly, we must also consider and compare the other testimonies of antiquity on the subject.

SEC. 179. *Testimonies of Antiquity respecting the
Robber-Synod.*

In a communication addressed to the Emperor Valentinian III. and Marcian (the successor of Theodosius II.), and also read at the Council of Chalcedon, Bishop Eusebius of

Pope Leo speaks in his letters on the subject (*Epp.* 43, 44) only of an appeal in general, in consequence of which a Synod was to be summoned. The Emperor Valentinian III., on the contrary, says: Flavian had appealed to the Roman bishop (*Ep.* 55 among those of Leo), and the same is asserted by the Empress Placidia (*Ep.* 56 among those of Leo), and Liberatus in his history (*Breviarium*) of the Eutychian sects (see p. 257). Quesnel expressed the opinion, in a separate dissertation (*De causa Flaviani*, printed in the Ballerini edition of the works of Leo, t. ii. p. 1133 sqq.), that Flavian had only appealed to the council, and had handed over his appeal to the Roman legates, so that the Pope might see to the convoking of a new Synod. The Ballerini, on the other hand, think (*l.c.* p. 1153 sqq.) that the appeal was addressed to the Pope and to a Synod (but a Roman, not an Œcumenical).

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 927 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 268 sqq. Besides Æthericus, Basil, and Seleucus, the priest Longinus also subscribed as representative of Bishop Dorotheus of Neocæsarea, although this last had been a member of the Synod of Constantinople. Of Bishops Longinus, Meliphthongus, and Timotheus, on the contrary (see above, p. 242), there is as little any signature to be found as of Flavian. They appear to have been of firmer character.

Dorylæum complains that Dioscurus, at the second Synod of Ephesus, by *money* and by the *brute force of his troops*, oppressed the orthodox faith, and confirmed the heresy of Eutyches.¹ Besides, at the Synod of Chalcedon it came out that Dioscurus had given permission only to his own notaries, and to those of some friends, the Bishops Thalassius of Cæsarea and Juvenal of Jerusalem, to draw up the proceedings of the Synod; whilst the notaries of the other bishops were not once allowed to write anything for their masters. When, however, two notaries of Bishop Stephen of Ephesus did so, Dioscurus' notaries came up to them, erased what they had written, and almost broke their fingers in taking away their writing materials. In the same manner it appeared that Dioscurus, at the close of the Synod, after the judgment had been pronounced upon Flavian and Eusebius, immediately compelled the bishops at the same time to append their names to a paper which was not yet filled up, so that they might not have the opportunity of further considering the matter, and that those who refused to sign had much to suffer. They were shut up in the church until night, and even those who were ill were not allowed to go out for a moment to refresh themselves. For companions they had soldiers and monks, with swords and sticks, and thus they were taught to subscribe. Bishop Stephen of Ephesus became security for a few who did not subscribe until the next day.²

To the same effect Bishop Basil of Seleucia deposed at the Synod of Chalcedon, that he had certainly altered at Ephesus the vote which he had given at Constantinople (p. 248), but he had done this from dread of Dioscurus. The latter had exercised great constraint over those who were present, both by his words and by the people whom he had placed outside and inside the church. Armed soldiers had even been introduced into the church, the monks of Barsumas too, and the Parabolani,³ and a great crowd of people stood around. In this way Dioscurus had frightened them all. When some

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 583 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 70.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 623 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 93.

³ [A kind of inferior deacons. See art. in *Dicty. of Christian Antiquities*.]

would not agree to the condemnation of Flavian, and others tried to get away, he had stood up in an elevated position, and cried out, "Those who do not subscribe will have to settle it with me." As a completion of these statements of Basil, Bishop Onesiphorus of Iconium declared, that, after reading the fundamental proposition or rule, that nothing should be altered in the Nicene faith, he had immediately suspected that this would be turned against Flavian, and had said this quietly to those who sat near him. One of these, Bishop Epiphanius of Perga, had given his opinion that this was impossible, as Flavian had in no way offended; but Dioscurus had suddenly got up and proclaimed the condemnation of Flavian, as involved in that rule. Then he had risen with some other bishops, had embraced the knees of Dioscurus, and urged upon him that "Flavian had done nothing worthy of *condemnation*, but if he had done anything worthy of *blame*, they should be satisfied with blaming him." But Dioscurus had risen from his throne, and cried: "Will you rebel? The Counts shall come." Thus, he continued, we were intimidated, and subscribed.

When Dioscurus would have denied that he called for the Counts, Bishop Marinian of Synnada stood up and declared that he, with Onesiphorus and Nunnechius of Laodicea, had embraced the knees of Dioscurus, and said: "Thou hast also priests under thee, and a *bishop* ought not to be deposed for the sake of a *priest*." But Dioscurus had replied: "I will pronounce no other judgment, even if my tongue should be cut out for it." As, however, the bishops already named continued to clasp his knees, he had called for the Counts, and they had entered with the Proconsul, who brought with him many attendants and chains. In consequence of this, he said, they had all subscribed.—Dioscurus denied this, and proposed to appeal to witnesses, whom, however, he would not present until another time, as the bishops were then too much fatigued. He never presented them.¹

In the third session at Chalcedon, Eusebius of Dorylaeum presented a second complaint in writing, in which he repeated

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 827 sqq. ; Hardouin, l.c. p. 214 sqq.

the contents of his first, and added that he and Flavian had not ventured to bring forward their proof at Ephesus, and Dioscurus had constrained the bishops to sign a blank paper.¹ It was further asserted at the fourth session of the same Council, by Bishop Diogenes of Cyzicus, that the Abbot Barsumas had killed Flavian. He had exclaimed: "Strike him dead." When the bishops heard this, they all exclaimed: "Barsumas is a murderer, cast him out, out with him to the arena, let him be anathema."²

Important testimonies respecting the Robber-Synod are contained in the contemporary letters of Pope Leo. In the forty-fourth to the Emperor Theodosius, dated October 13, 449, he says (a) that Dioscurus had not allowed the two letters of the Pope to the Synod and to Flavian (the *Epistola dogmatica*) to be read at Ephesus; (b) that his deacon Hilarus had fled from the Synod that he might not be forced to subscribe; (c) that Dioscurus had not allowed all the bishops who were present to take part in the judgment, but only those of whose subserviency he was assured; (d) that the papal legates had protested against the heterodox declarations of the Synod, and had not allowed themselves to be forced by violence to assent to them; and (e) that Flavian had consigned to the papal legates a copy of his appeal. The Emperor should therefore be pleased to leave everything as it was before this Synod, and arrange for the holding of a new and greater Synod in Italy.³

In the next letter addressed to the Empress Pulcheria, and also dated October 13, Leo complains that it had not been possible for his legates to deliver the letter which he had given them for this princess. Only one of them, the deacon Hilarus, had succeeded in escaping and returning to Rome. He therefore again sent the letter destined for Pulcheria as an appendix to the present. His legates had protested at Ephesus that everything had been decided by the violence, or even by the rage of one single man (Dioscurus), and he had requested

¹ Mansi, *l.c.* p. 986; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 311.

² Mansi, *t. vii.* p. 68; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 423.

³ Leonis *Epist.* 44, in Baller. pp. 909-917; in Mansi, *t. vi.* p. 14 sqq.; Hardouin, *t. ii.* p. 23.

the Emperor not to confirm what had been done there, but rather to appoint the time and place for a Synod in Italy; and he entreated her to intercede with the Emperor and support this petition.¹

A remarkable letter, undated, probably appended to the one just mentioned, is one from the papal legate Hilarus to the same princess, saying that, "as he had not agreed to the unrighteous condemnation of Flavian, but on the contrary had appealed to another Council, he had no longer been permitted to go either to Constantinople or to Rome. Therefore he had not been able to convey the Pope's letter to the Princess. He had, however, succeeded, by leaving all his property behind him, in escaping by unknown ways to Rome, and informing the Pope."²

In his forty-seventh letter to Anastasius of Thessalonica, also of the 13th of October, Pope Leo congratulates this bishop that he had been prevented from taking part in the Synod of Ephesus; in consequence of which he had not been forced by armed violence and insolence to subscribe. Dioscurus had given vent to his ancient personal hatred and jealousy of Flavian. Anastasius, however, must not accept the decrees of that Synod.³ At the same time Pope Leo also expressed his sorrow at what had been done in his letters to Bishop Julian of Cos, to the clergy and laity of Constantinople, to the archimandrites there, and to Archbishop Flavian, as the death of the latter was not yet known to him.⁴ Many other of his letters no less contain numerous complaints of the outrages of Dioscurus; and the ninety-fifth, to Pulcheria, dated July 20, 451, for the first time designates the Ephesine assembly by the name which afterwards was universally applied to it, the *latrocinium*.⁵

That Dioscurus also deposed the (absent) Theodoret of Cyrus at the Robber-Synod, without having heard him at all, or having interrogated him with respect to his faith on the

¹ *Epist.* 45, p. 919 sqq.; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 19 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 29.

² *Epist.* 46, p. 925 sqq.; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 23 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 34.

³ *Epist.* 47, p. 929 sqq.; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 27.

⁴ *Epp.* 48, 49, 50, 51, p. 930 sqq.; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 28 sqq.

⁵ *Epist.* 95, p. 1077; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 138.

point in question, Theodoret himself mentions in a letter to Pope Leo.¹ In another to the monks of Constantinople, he says that his enemies had spent a great deal of money in order to procure this judgment.² In a third letter to Bishop John of Germanicia, Theodoret mentions that Domnus of Antioch had also been deposed at the Robber-Synod, because he would not agree to the twelve anathematisms of Cyril, whilst Bishop Candidian of Antioch in Pisidia had remained unpunished, although often accused of adultery. They had also at Ephesus restored Bishops Athenius and Athanasius, who had been deposed by the Eastern Synod.³

Noteworthy testimonies as to the outrages of Dioscurus and the intimidation of the bishops by *military* are also found in the letters of the Western Emperor, Valentinian III., of his wife Eudoxia, and of his mother Galla Placidia, to Theodosius and Pulcheria.⁴ In particular, the Empress Eudoxia calls the Synod of Ephesus a *tumultuous and unhappy* one, and Valentinian, too, speaks of its tumultuous character.

To these epistolary communications on the Synod of Ephesus may be added several testimonies of ancient historians, from which we learn some things which we could not obtain from other sources. We naturally place first among these the contemporary of the Robber-Synod, Prosper of Aquitaine, to whom in particular we owe three statements—(a) that Pope Leo had sent two legates, Bishop Julius of Puteoli and the deacon Hilarus, to Ephesus; (b) that Hilarus, because he opposed Dioscurus, when they were using the military to enforce subscription, went in great danger of his life, and only by leaving all his property behind, had been

¹ Theodoret, *Epist.* 113, Opp. iv. p. 1187, ed. Schulze. Also among the letters of Leo in the Ballerini Collection, No. 52, p. 941. In Mansi, t. vi. p. 35. A special treatise on the deposition of Theodoret and his restoration by the Synod of Chalcedon, by Quesnel, is reprinted with the criticisms of the Ballerini, in their edition of the Works of Leo, t. ii. p. 1237 sq., 1257 sq.

² Theodoret, *Epist.* 145, t. iv. p. 1244 sq., ed. Schulze.

³ Theodoret, *Epist.* 147, ed. Schulze, t. iv. p. 1275 sqq.

⁴ Nos. 55–58 among the letters of Leo, in Ballerini, t. i. p. 961 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 50 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 35 sqq. Eudoxia was a daughter of Theodosius II., Galla Placidia, a sister of Arcadius and Honorius; but Valentinian III. was sister's child of Theodosius II., a son of that Galla Placidia and of the Patrician, afterwards Caesar, Constantius.

able to escape home ; and (c) that the holy Flavian had gone to Christ by a glorious death, at the hands of those who were appointed to convey him to the place of his banishment.¹

The somewhat later anonymous author of the *Breviculus Historie Eutychieistarum* says: "At this Synod there were also present the representatives sent by the Apostolic See, Bishop Julius of Puteoli and the Archdeacon Hilarus. *The Presbyter Renatus, however, died during the journey to Ephesus in the island of Delos.* The Roman notary Dulcitus was also present. The dogmatic letter of Leo to Flavian was not allowed to be read, and they spent the whole of the first day, the 8th of August, in reading the Acts of the first Synod of Ephesus and the judgment of Flavian on Eutyches (*i.e.* the Acts of Constantinople). In spite of the opposition of the Roman legates, Flavian was deposed, and Eusebius of Dorylæum was condemned as a Nestorian, although he, when yet a layman, had stood up as an accuser of Nestorius. These Eutychieans would not allow that between them and Nestorius there was a third party, and held every one who was not an Eutychiean for a thorough Nestorian (a very good remark!) . . . Three days after the deposition of Flavian, Domnus of Antioch was also deposed, after which Dioscurus departed in haste, and the assembly was dissolved. Flavian was carried into exile, and died at Epipa, a city of Lydia, whether by a natural or a violent death, and Anatolius, an adherent of Dioscurus, became Bishop of Constantinople."²

Something more we learn from Liberatus (sixth century) in his *Breviarium*. (a) Dioscurus had the bravest soldiers and the monks of Barsumas around him. (b) The legates of the Pope were not allowed to sit with the bishops, as the presidency had not been conceded to the Roman see ; that is, because the legates were not allowed to preside, they took no seat at all,

¹ Prosperi *Chronica*, in Basnage, *Thesaur.* t. i. p. 304.

² In the appendix of Sirmond *ad Codicem Theodos.* p. 113 sqq. The account here given of the death of Flavian, with which that of Prosper (see above) also agrees, is the more probable ; and when Barsumas was called his murderer at the Synod of Chalcedon, this must be understood to mean that, by his ill-treatment of Flavian, he was indirectly the cause of his death. Nicephorus, lib. xiv. c. 47, says that Flavian died on the third day after the Synod, in consequence of the ill-treatment which he received.

but stood *extra ordinem*. (c) At the command of Dioscurus the Synod condemned Bishop Ibas of Edessa in his absence as having, by not appearing at the Synod, shown his contempt for it. He was summoned three times, and his enemies accused him of having said: "I do not envy Christ for having become God, for I too can become this, if I like." His letter to Maris was also brought against him. (d) In the same way, at the suggestion of Dioscurus, the Synod condemned Theodoret in his absence, on account of his writings against the twelve anathematisms of Cyril, and on account of his letter to the clergy, monks, and laity, which he had written against the first Synod of Ephesus, before the establishment of peace. (e) Bishop Sabinianus of Perrha was also deposed; and (f) last of all, Domnus of Antioch, although he had agreed in everything with Dioscurus. When on one occasion Domnus, by reason of sickness, was not present at a session of the Synod (some time back we saw that this was on the third day after the deposition of Flavian), Dioscurus brought out letters which Domnus had some time before addressed to him *privatim* against the twelve chapters of Cyril, and now condemned him on account of them.¹ (g) Flavian appealed by the legates to the apostolic see (see above, p. 251, note 2). (h) Flavian, beaten and seriously injured, died in consequence of the blows which he had received. (i) In the place of Flavian, the deacon Anatolius, hitherto the secretary of Dioscurus, was appointed Bishop of Constantinople; in the place of Domnus of Antioch, Maximus; in the place of Ibas, Nonnus; and in the place of Sabinianus, Athanasius. No others were chosen in the places of Theodoret and Eusebius of Dorylæum. (k) Fleeing from Ephesus, the legates of the Pope came to Rome and reported what had taken place.²

Evagrius relates that, besides those already named, Bishops Daniel of Carre, Irenæus of Tyre, and Aquilinus of Byblus were also deposed at the Robber-Synod; and, on the other hand, resolutions were drawn up in favour of Bishop Sophro-

¹ On the proceedings against Domnus, Quesnel composed a special dissertation, reprinted, with the criticisms of the Ballerini, in the edition of Leo's *Works*, t. ii. p. 1183 sqq. and 1215 sqq.

² *Liberati Breviar.* c. 12, in Galland. t. xii. p. 140.

nus of Constantina (in Phœnicia).¹ In another place (ii. 2) Evagrius also adduces the testimony of Eusebius of Dorylæum, to the effect that Flavian, beaten and kicked by Dioscurus, had miserably perished.

Finally, the Byzantine Theophanes, although belonging only to the eighth century, contributes something which is worthy of notice. (a) Agreeing with the expression of Leo: *Latrocinium Ephesinum*, he calls this Synod a *σύνοδος ληστρική*, and says (b) that Flavian before his deposition was struck by Dioscurus both with hands and feet, and on the third day after died;² (c) that the papal legates, being always ridiculed, had taken flight and returned to Rome.³

SEC. 180. *Fortunes of the Papal Legates who had been deputed to the Robber-Synod.*

This last statement leads us to some remarks on the legates of Leo. We know that he had named three of these—Bishop Julius, the priest Renatus, and the deacon Hilarus. In all the documents of the Synod, however, there is nowhere the very slightest mention of Renatus; even at the beginning of the Synod only Julius and Hilarus, with the notary Dulcitus, are mentioned as being present. Accordingly Renatus does not appear to have been at Ephesus, and therefore that is credible which is said by the author of the *Breviculus Hist. Eutyck.* (see above, p. 258), that he died during the journey on the island of Delos. In direct contradiction to this, however, stands the hundred and sixteenth letter of Theodoret, which is addressed to this very Renatus, and is written *after the close of the Robber-Synod*. Theodoret praises him on account of his liberality and the zeal with which he had blamed the violence practised at the Robber-Synod. The whole world was, on this account, full of his fame. The legate had been present up to

¹ Evagrii *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 10.

² According to the testimony of the *Breviculus* already adduced, Flavian died considerably later in exile.

³ Theoph. *Chronographia*, ad ann. 5941, p. 145 sq. of the Bonn edition of Classen, a. 1839.

the deposition of Flavian, but he had then departed, and thus had not remained to witness the unjust condemnation of Theodoret.¹

Various attempts have been made to reconcile this contradiction, and to set some other points right. Quesnel gives it as his opinion, in his remarks on the twenty-eighth letter of Leo,² (a) that "the author of the *Breviculus* made a mistake; (b) that not Renatus, but Bishop Julius of Puteoli, died at Delos during the journey, and then that Bishop Julian of Cos had taken his place at Ephesus as papal legate, and therefore the reading, Julianus instead of Julius, which occurs in most manuscripts, is the correct one; (c) that the fact of Renatus not being mentioned in the Acts is a consequence of their incompleteness (!); (d) that after the close of the Synod, Hilary and Renatus had travelled back to Rome (Julian of Cos naturally had no reason for going there), but the former had arrived the earlier, on which account Leo, in his forty-fourth and forty-fifth letters (see above, p. 255), says that Hilary *alone* had returned to Rome; (e) and that Theodoret had written the letter in question to Renatus, who also returned there, but at a later period."

Against this hypothesis Baluzius³ and the Ballerini⁴ protested, and, as it appears to me, with full right. (a) In the first place, there are two quite arbitrary fictions, that the legate Julius died, and that Bishop Julian of Cos became his substitute. (b) In the next place, the silence of the Acts of Ephesus not only makes it probable that Renatus was not present at the Synod, but also the contemporaneous Prosper knows of only *two* papal legates, Julius and Hilarus, and this confirms the statement of the *Breviculus*. (c) If, however, Theodoret nevertheless writes to Renatus, either the *superscription* of the letter is false (for the name of Renatus never occurs in the text), or Theodoret has made a mistake and confounded

¹ Theodoret, *Epist.* 116, p. 1196 sq., ed. Schulze.

² Printed in the Ballerini edition of Leo's *Works*, t. ii. p. 1410 sqq.

³ In the *Præfat.* to his edition of the *Antiqua Versio Concilii Chalced.* n. xxx. sq. in Mansi, t. vii. p. 665.

⁴ Leonis *Opp.*, ed. Baller. t. ii. p. 1411 sqq., in their annotations to the treatise of Quesnel referred to above. With them agreed also Walch, *Ketzer-historie*, Bd. vi. S. 250 ff.

Renatus with Hilarus, with respect to whom the statement in the letter is quite accurate.

To this we add only that we know nothing more of the legate Julius. Before the end of the first session at Ephesus, we meet only with Hilarus; he alone, and not also Julius with him, protests against the deposition of Flavian, and it is of Hilarus alone that Pope Leo says that he was able to escape and save himself. Of Julius, however, just as little as of Renatus, is there any word in the later epistles of the Pope. Theophanes (see above, p. 260) professes to know that Julius also had returned to Rome; and Liberatus also (p. 258 f.) speaks of the return of the legates in the plural. On this statement Tillemont makes the remark that Julius must necessarily have returned later than Hilarus, as Leo says nothing of him in his forty-fourth and forty-fifth letters.¹

¹ Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. xv. p. 577.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ROBBER-SYNOD IS TO BE CONFRONTED BY A NEW AND GREATER COUNCIL.

SEC. 181. *Theodosius II. for, Pope Leo I. against, the Robber-Synod. Synods at Rome and Milan.*

AFTER all that we know and have already brought forward respecting the disposition of the Byzantine Court at that time, it could not be doubted that the Emperor Theodosius II., in spite of all the counter-representations of the Pope and the Latin Court (see above, p. 255 ff.), would confirm the decrees of the Robber-Synod; and he actually did so in a decree which is still extant in Latin, as follows: "When Nestorius endeavoured to violate the old faith, he had been condemned at the Synod of Ephesus. This Synod had also confirmed the Nicene Confession of Faith, and he (the Emperor) had, in accordance with these synodal decrees, published a law condemning Nestorius. More recently, however, Flavian of Constantinople, and another bishop named Eusebius, following the errors of Nestorius, had raised a new controversy, and therefore the Emperor had convoked a great Council of Bishops of all places to Ephesus, which had deposed Flavian, Eusebius, Domnus, Theodoret, and some others on account of their being entangled in the Nestorian heresy. The decrees of this Synod he commended and confirmed, and he gave command that all the bishops of his empire should immediately subscribe the Nicene Creed, and that no adherent of Nestorius or Flavian should ever be raised to a bishopric. If, however, such a thing should be done, he should be deposed. Nothing whatever was to be added to the Nicene word of faith, and nothing should be taken away from it. No one was to read the writings of Nestorius and Theodoret; on the contrary, every

one was to give them up to be burnt. The Nestorians were to be tolerated neither in the cities nor in the country, and whoever tolerated them should be punished with confiscation of goods and perpetual exile.”¹

It was clear that this edict had the force of law only in the Byzantine Empire, and not also in the West; but even in the former, on account of its stringency, it could not obtain universal authority; on the contrary, there now arose a great ecclesiastical schism in the East. Egypt, Thrace, and Palestine held with Dioscurus and the Emperor; the bishops of Syria, Pontus, and Asia, on the contrary, with Flavian.² That Theodoret of Cyrus turned to Rome we have already noted, and we may now add that in three letters to the Pope, to Renatus, and to the Archdeacon (Hilarus), he appealed (*ἐπικαλεῖσθαι*) to the judgment of Rome, of whose Primacy he speaks in the strongest terms, asking that a new Synod may be held. To this he requests the Pope to summon him and there to try and examine his teaching, and generally to take an interest in the Oriental Church. At the same time he expresses his complete agreement with the *Epistola dogmatica* of Leo, upon which he bestows great praise.³—Whether Theodoret presented an appeal to Rome in the full sense of the word, or not, is a disputed question which does not concern us very nearly here, and which has been decided in the negative by Quesnel, Dupin, and others, and in the affirmative by the Ballerini and others.⁴

In a second letter Theodoret asked the Patrician Anatolius of Constantinople to intercede for him, that he might have permission to travel to the wished-for Roman Council.⁵

In fact, Pope Leo immediately held a considerable Western Synod (*occidentale concilium* it is called by his deacon Hilarus

¹ Printed in Mansi, t. vii. p. 495, and by Hardouin, t. ii. p. 673, among the Acts of the Synod of Chalcedon. A second ancient Latin version of this imperial edict is found among the Acts of the fifth Œcumenical Synod in Mansi, t. ix. p. 250, and Hardouin, t. iii. p. 105, with the variation that here the books of Diodorus of Tarsus and of Theodore of Mopsuestia are mentioned among those which are forbidden.

² Liberat. *Breviar.* c. 12, in Galland. t. xii. p. 140.

³ Theodoret, *Epp.* 113, 116, 118, p. 1187 sqq. t. iv., ed. Schulze.

⁴ Cf. Leonis *Opp.* ed. Baller. t. ii. p. 1237 sqq. and p. 1257 sqq., and Walch, *Ketzehist.* Bd. vi. S. 272 ff.

⁵ Theodoret, *Ep.* 119, p. 1200, *l.c.*

in his letter to Pulcheria), and in agreement with this Synod rejected all that had been done at the Robber-Synod.¹ The *libellus synodicus* also speaks of this Roman Council,² with the addition which is certainly not quite warranted, that Leo had here pronounced an anathema upon Dioscurus and Eutyches, and had sent a solemn announcement of it to the Clergy, Senate, and Laity of Constantinople.³ More certain is it that Dioscurus, about that time, took upon him to pronounce a sentence of excommunication on Leo, as is clear from the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon.⁴

In agreement with this Roman Synod,⁵ Pope Leo immediately wrote, on the 13th October 449, to the Emperor Theodosius II., saying, that until a greater Synod of Bishops from all parts of the world could be held, he should be pleased to allow everything to remain in the *status* which existed before the recently-held Synod at Ephesus, and to give orders for the holding of an Œcumenical Synod in Italy, especially as Flavian had appealed. As to what must be done *after* an appeal had been presented, that had already been declared in the Nicene (properly, Sardican) Canons, which he appended.⁶

Leo wrote in similar terms to Pulcheria, and asked for her support with her brother, and his archdeacon Hilarus also appealed in this matter to the influential princess.⁷—We have already seen (see p. 256) that the Pope had also written to Bishop Anastasius of Thessalonica (*Epist.* 47), and to the Clergy, Laity, and Archimandrites of Constantinople, in order to warn them not to acknowledge the Ephesine Synod (*Epp.*

¹ So the deacon Hilarus says in the letter referred to above to Pulcheria, No. 46 among the letters of Leo, ed. Baller. t. i. p. 926 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 24 sqq.

² Cf. on the *Libellus*, vol. i. p. 78.

³ In Mansi, t. vi. p. 509; Hardouin, t. v. p. 1523.

⁴ Mansi, t. vi. p. 1009; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 323. Cf. Walch, *l.c.* S. 290; Tillemont, *l.c.* p. 603.

⁵ This agreement is clear from Leonis *Ep.* 61, p. 984, and *Ep.* 69, p. 1008, ed. Baller.; in Mansi, t. vi. pp. 65 and 83.

⁶ Leonis *Epp.* 43, 44, in Ballerin. t. i. pp. 901–918; Mansi, t. vi. p. 7 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 23, 27. Cf. above, p. 255 f. The 44th letter was probably written a few days later than the 43d. Cf. Ballerin. *l.c.* p. 898, n. 7; and Mansi, *l.c.* p. 6, n. 7. On the interchange of the Nicene and Sardican canons, see vol. i. pp. 356 and 369.

⁷ Leonis *Epp.* 45, 46, in Ballerini, t. i. p. 919 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 19 sqq. Cf. above, p. 256..

50 and 51).—Somewhat later, at Christmas in the same year (449), he appealed again to the Emperor Theodosius, assured him of his steadfastness in the Nicene faith, and repeated the request for the holding of a great Council in Italy.¹

Before he received an answer to this, in the early part of the year 450, the Latin Emperor Valentinian III. came with his wife Eudoxia (a daughter of Theodosius II.), and his mother Galla Placidia (aunt of Theodosius), to Rome, in order to pay his devotions there on the Festival of the holy Apostle Peter (at the Festival of the See of Peter, S. Peter's Day, February 22, 450). While they were praying in S. Peter's Church, Pope Leo came to them in company with many bishops out of various provinces, and earnestly entreated them for their kind intercessions with the Emperor Theodosius. And not only Valentinian but the two exalted ladies responded to his wish, and towards the end of February 450 addressed three letters to the Emperor of the East, and a fourth to his sister Pulcheria, in which, while maintaining the high dignity of the Roman see, they entreat him to commit the existing controversy to the sentence of the Pope, to whom Flavian had appealed, and to a new Council to be held in Italy.²

The Emperor Theodosius answered, about Easter 450, with a refusal, saying that everything had been settled at Ephesus with complete liberty and entirely in accordance with the truth, and that Flavian had been justly deposed on account of innovations in the faith.³—Before Leo could receive this distressing intelligence, he had already learnt to his joy, that the clergy, the aristocracy, and the people of Constantinople had for the most part remained loyal to the orthodox faith, and were asking for his help and support. He commended them for this in a letter written in March 450, and briefly expounded to them the orthodox doctrine on the person of Christ.⁴ Per-

¹ *Epist.* 54. On the date of this letter of the Ballerini, *l.c.* p. 957, note 8; and Walch, *l.c.* S. 210.

² Among the letters of Leo, Nos. 55, 56, 57, 58, in Baller. t. i. p. 961 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 35 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 50 sqq. Cf. above, p. 257.

³ *Epist.* 62, 63, 64 among those of Leo, in Baller. t. i. p. 985 sqq.; in Hardouin, t. ii. p. 39 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 67 sqq.

⁴ *Epist.* 59, in Baller. p. 975 sqq.; in Hardouin, t. ii. p. 31; Mansi, t. vi. p. 58 sqq.

haps he was still more rejoiced at a letter from Pulcheria, in which (for the first time) she clearly declared that she saw and abhorred what was erroneous in the teaching of Eutyches. Leo therefore wrote a short letter to her on the 17th of March 450, in which he commended her, saying, that, after the receipt of her letter, he asked her anew for her support, and now with still greater urgency and confidence.¹ On the same day he also exhorted anew the Archimandrites and Priests, Martin and Faustus of Constantinople, to stedfastness in the orthodox faith.²

Directly after this, in May 450, Leo endeavoured to interest the Gallican bishops in the dominant doctrinal question, having at the same time to meet with them in order to settle the contest for the primacy between Arles and Vienne; and he succeeded in this with the best results, as is testified by his letter to the Archbishop Ravennius of Arles, and the answer of several Gallican bishops.³ With equal decision, a year later, the bishops of Upper Italy, at a Synod at Milan, declared in favour of the orthodox faith, and accepted Leo's *Epistola dogmatica*, as we see from the letter of Archbishop Eusebius of Milan to the Pope, in the summer of 451.⁴

With equal tact and courtesy as decision Leo further resisted, in his letter of July 16, 450 (*Ep.* 69), the request of the Emperor Theodosius to recognize Anatolius, the successor of Flavian, as Bishop of Constantinople. Anatolius had, in a special letter, of which only a fragment yet remains,⁵ requested this confirmation from Rome, and the Emperor, as well as the consecrators of the new bishop, had supported his request. Leo therefore wrote to Theodosius: Before he could decide on this matter, the elected person must first of all testify to his orthodoxy, a thing which was required of every Catholic. Anatolius should therefore read the writings of the Fathers of the Church on the doctrine of the Incarnation, particularly those of S. Cyril and of the Synod of Ephesus,

¹ *Epist.* 60, in Baller, p. 982; Mansi, t. vi. p. 64.

² *Epist.* 61, in Baller, p. 983; Mansi, t. vi. p. 65.

³ *Epist.* 67, 68, in Baller, p. 1000 sqq.; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 78 sqq. Epistles 65 and 66 refer to the controversy respecting the Gallican primacy.

⁴ Among the letters of Leo, No. 97, ed. Baller, p. 1080; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 141.

⁵ *Epist.* 53, among the letters of Leo, p. 953, in Baller.

also the letter of the Pope to Flavian, and then publicly subscribe an orthodox confession of faith, and send it to the apostolic see and to all the churches. At the same time, he said he was sending two bishops, Abundius and Asterius, and two priests, Basil and Senator, as legates, to Constantinople, in order to speak more confidentially with the Emperor, and to explain to him the creed of the Pope. If the Bishop of Constantinople should honestly agree with this creed, he would rejoice at having secured the peace of the Church, and lay aside all other doubts (respecting Anatolius); in case, however, some should still fail to agree with the true faith of the Pope and the Fathers, then an Œcumenical Council in Italy would be necessary, to the holding of which the Emperor would, he hoped, consent.¹

We see that, even during the life of Theodosius II., Leo regarded the holding of a new great Synod as superfluous, in case all the bishops should, without any such Synod, make an orthodox confession of the faith—a circumstance which casts a necessary light, which has not been sufficiently regarded, upon his conduct after the death of Theodosius.

The same is contained in a letter of Leo's to Pulcheria, of the same date (*Epist.* 70). A third, addressed a day later, to the Archimandrites of Constantinople, says that Anatolius and his consecrators (among them Dioscurus, whose excommunication of the Pope followed afterwards) had informed him of the election and ordination of the new Bishop of Constantinople, but not of his orthodoxy, and of the suppression of heresy in his neighbourhood. He had therefore sent four legates to the Emperor, and asked the Archimandrites to support them according to their ability.²

SEC. 182. *Pulcheria and Marcian come to the Throne.*

It is probable that Theodosius was already dead when those papal legates arrived at Constantinople, for he died in consequence of a fall from his horse, July 28, 450. As he left no male succession, and as his sister Pulcheria, in the year 415,

¹ *Epist.* 69, in Baller. p. 1005; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 83 sqq.

² *Epist.* 71, in Baller. p. 1011; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 88.

when he was still a boy, had been raised to be *Augusta* and Co-regent, the crown now fell to her, and not to Eudoxia, the daughter of the late Emperor, who was married to Valentinian III., the Emperor of the West. As, however, a woman had never governed the Roman Empire alone, either in the East or in the West, Pulcheria offered her hand and her throne to Marcian,¹ one of the most distinguished generals and statesmen of the time, a man very highly esteemed for piety and ability, on condition that she should not be disturbed in her vow of perpetual virginity. On Marcian's consenting, she presented him to her assembled council as her husband and as the future Emperor. The selection met with universal approval in the army, among the officers of state, and among the people, and Marcian was solemnly crowned on the 24th of August 450. The Emperor Valentinian gave his assent to that which had been done, and the new Emperor gained for himself such renown, that all writers number him among the best, the most pious, and the most virtuous of princes that ever sat upon a throne, and many exalt him even above Constantine and Theodosius the Great.

Upon this the position of ecclesiastical affairs suddenly changed, since Marcian, like Pulcheria, was devoted to the orthodox faith, and, moreover, the previous chief protector of Eutychianism, the minister Chrysaphius, was executed on account of his numerous acts of injustice (whether shortly before or after the death of Theodosius is doubtful). Dioscurus rightly foresaw what he had to fear from the new Emperor, and therefore endeavoured to prevent his recognition in Egypt;² but the attempt miscarried, and could only strengthen the dislike entertained for the Alexandrian, who was now doubly deserving of punishment. With Pope Leo, on the other hand, Marcian entered into friendly correspondence soon after he ascended the throne, and informed him at once, in his first letter (at the end of August or the beginning of September 450), that by God's providence, and the election

¹ He was a widower. After his elevation to the throne, he married Euphemia, his daughter by his first marriage, to Anthimus, afterwards Emperor of the West.

² Walch, *Ketzehist.* Bd. vi. S. 307.

of the Senate and the army, he had become Emperor. He adds that he now, above all things, in the cause of the orthodox faith, for the sake of which he had obtained his power, appealed to Leo, who had the oversight and the first place in the faith (τὴν τε σὴν ἀγῶσύνην ἐπισκοπεύουσιν καὶ ἄρχουσιν τῆς θελας πίστεως), and requested him to intercede with God for the security of his government. Finally, he declares that he is favourable to the holding of the Synod suggested by Leo (σοῦ αὐθεντοῦντος), for the extirpation of heresy and the restoration of peace.¹

Somewhat later, on the 22d of November 450, the Emperor Marcian addressed a second letter to Leo, and assured him anew of his zeal for the true religion, remarking that he had received the papal legates with pleasure and in a friendly manner (the four named above, who had been sent to Theodosius). It now only remained that the Pope should be pleased to come in person to the East, and there to celebrate the Synod. If this, however, was too great a burden to lay upon him, Leo would inform him of it, so that by a circular letter he might summon all the bishops of the East, of Thrace, and of Illyricum, to a place that might suit him (the Emperor) to a Synod. There they should establish what might be advantageous to the Catholic faith, in accordance with the manner stated by the Pope (in his letter to Flavian).²

At the same time there arrived in Rome a third letter, one from Pulcheria, with the important intelligence that Bishop Anatolius of Constantinople had come over to the orthodox side, had acknowledged the confession of faith contained in the papal letter (to Flavian), and had rejected the (Eutychian) heresy which had recently found acceptance with some, as Leo might perceive from Anatolius' own letter. The latter had subscribed the doctrinal letter (*Epistola dogmatica*) of Leo without any hesitation. The Pope would be pleased to grant the expression required by the Emperor (as to whether he would come to the Council in person or not), so that all the bishops

¹ Leonis *Epist.* 73, p. 1017 sqq. t. i. ed. Baller.; in Hardouin, t. ii. p. 41; Mansi, t. vi. p. 94.

² *Epist.* 76, p. 1023, l.c.; in Hardouin, t. ii. p. 41; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 98.

of the East, of Thrace, and Illyricum might be summoned to a Synod. At this a resolution should be taken respecting the Catholic confession, and respecting the bishops who had been for some time in a state of separation (the adherents of the Robber-Synod), at Leo's suggestion (σοῦ ἀυθεντοῦντος). At the command of the Emperor the body of Flavian had been brought to Constantinople, and solemnly laid in the basilica of the apostles, where the former bishops lay buried. The Emperor had further ordered the recall of those bishops who had been exiled with Flavian on account of the faith. Their episcopal sees should, however, not be restored to them until the close of the Synod about to be held.¹

That Theodoret of Cyrus was included among the bishops recalled we learn from his letters 138 to 140,² in which he declares the convocation of a new Synod to be very necessary. This was as strongly insisted upon and asked for by Eusebius of Dorylaeum, who, as it appears, had not yet been recalled from exile, and was still in Rome, under the protection of the Pope.³

SEC. 183. *Synods at Constantinople.*

The information which Pulcheria gave, as we have seen, respecting Bishop Anatolius, is connected with a Synod which the latter had held, a short time before, at Constantinople. That at this Synod the whole clergy of that city, the monks, and many bishops who were present, had accepted Leo's letter to Flavian, we learn from Leo himself in his 88th letter, dated June 24, 451; and besides, there is a reference to it, as well as to a still earlier Synod at Constantinople under Anatolius, in the Acts of the fourth session of Chalcedon.⁴ The Metropolitan Photius of Tyre then complained that Eustathius of Berytus had taken from him some towns belonging to his province, and that this had been confirmed

¹ Among the letters of Leo, No. 77, p. 1027, t. i. ed. Baller.; in Hardouin, t. ii. p. 43; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 99 sqq.

² *Opp.* t. iv. ed. Schulze, p. 1229 sqq.

³ Cf. Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 2; and Leonis *Epp.* 79 and 80.

⁴ Mansi, t. vii. p. 85 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 435 sqq.

by a Synod at Constantinople under Anatolius. In the reply to this, Eustathius related, "that very recently the letter of Leo had been sent for subscription by the Synod at Constantinople (under Anatolius) to the absent metropolitans, and in like manner at the (somewhat earlier) Synod held during the life of Theodosius II. those who were absent had been allowed to add their subscriptions, and it was of this that Photius was complaining." We see from this that Anatolius held *two* Synods *before* the Council of Chalcedon, or, more exactly, as is clear from the further contents of the Acts, that Anatolius had twice collected around him those bishops who were then present in Constantinople at what is called a *σύνδοδος ἐνδημούσα*, the first time under Theodosius II., in reference to the matter of Photius,¹ the second time under Marcian, for the acknowledgment of the orthodox faith and the *Epistola dogmatica* of Leo. Hardouin and Walch, on the other hand, have erroneously fused the two Synods into one, and Remi Ceillier, too, has spoken only of one.²

We obtain a more complete account of the second Synod under Anatolius in the history of the life of S. Abundius, who, as we saw above (p. 268), was then Pope's legate at Constantinople. This biography certainly is not written by a contemporary, and is not very ancient; but the fragment from the Acts of the Synod which it embodies (which is also distinguished by a different style from the rest, from the word *mox*) has a good claim to credibility, as has been shown by the Ballerini and by Walch.³ It says that Anatolius had held a Council of all the bishops (that is, then present at Constantinople), archimandrites, priests, and deacons. The letter of Leo, which his legate Abundius delivered, had been publicly read. Anatolius had agreed to it *summa devotione*, and had subscribed it, and at the same time had pronounced an anathema upon Eutyches, Nestorius, and the adherents of their heresies. The same had

¹ See further on this subject below, in the history of the Council of Chalcedon.

² Walch, *Ketzerh.* Bd. vi. S. 306; *Historie der Kirchenvers.* S. 305; Remi Ceillier, *Histoire des auteurs sacrés*, t. xiv. p. 649; Hardouin, t. i. in the *Index ad ann.* 450.

³ Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. vi. S. 316; Leonis *Opp.* ed. Baller. t. i. p. 1487, where also the fragment in question is printed. It is also given twice in Mansi, t. vi. p. 513, and t. vii. p. 775.

been done by all the bishops, priests, archimandrites, and deacons. For this Abundius and the other legates of the Pope had immediately given thanks to God, and on their part had pronounced an anathema upon Eutyches and his adherents, as well as upon Nestorius. — The time of the holding of this Synod at Constantinople cannot now be exactly ascertained; but it may be inferred from the letter of Pulcheria, noticed above, that it took place shortly before that letter was composed (probably in November 450).

Sec. 184. *Pope Leo wishes to restore Ecclesiastical Unity without a new Council.*

Archbishop Anatolius of Constantinople had also, on his side, sent envoys to the Pope, the priest Casterius, and the two deacons Patricius and Asclepiades,¹ in order to inform him of all that had taken place. When they returned, Leo gave them letters to Anatolius, to the Emperor, to Pulcheria, and to Bishop Julian of Cos, which are all dated April 13, 451, and are still preserved.² The letter to the Emperor (*Ep.* 78) is only a letter of courtesy; in that to Pulcheria (*Ep.* 79), however, the Pope says that it was especially by her influence that first the Nestorian and now the Eutychian heresy had been subdued. He thanks her for the benefits she has conferred upon the Church, for the kind support of the Roman legates, for the recall of the banished Catholic bishops, and for the honourable burial of the body of Flavian. He further adds, that he has learned from his legates, and from the envoys of Anatolius, that many of those bishops who had given ear to the impiety now wished for reconciliation and restoration to the communion of the Catholics; and this should be granted to them by the papal legates and by Anatolius in common, if they had corrected their error, and by their own signatures condemned the heresy. He also mentions that Eusebius of Dorylaeum still remained with him, and had been received into his communion. The Empress

¹ They are mentioned in the letter of Leo (*Ep.* 80) to Anatolius.

² Leonis *Epist.* 78, 79, 80, 81, p. 1033 sqq. t. i. ed. Baller.; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 103 sqq.

should be pleased to take under her protection the Church of this man, which, as was reported, had been devastated by the intruded bishop. Finally, he recommends to her also Bishop Julian of Cos, and the clergy of Constantinople, who had remained faithful to Flavian.

The letter to Anatolius (*Ep.* 80) begins with the expression of joy that this bishop and his whole church had taken the side of evangelical truth. He received him therefore with affection into the one chaste communion (of the Bride of Christ), and approved of the documents furnished with the subscriptions (of the Synod of Constantinople). In regard to the bishops who had allowed themselves to be led astray by the violence of the Robber-Synod to side with foreign injustice, he confirmed the decree established in the presence and with the co-operation of his legates (at the Synod of Constantinople), that these must for the present be satisfied to be again received into communion with their churches;¹ Anatolius might, however, in conjunction with the papal legates, consider which of them should again be taken into full Church communion with the Pope. First, however, they must be required to anathematize the heresies. The names of Dioscurus, Juvenal, and Eustathius of Berytus must be struck out of the diptychs, and must no longer be read at the altar in Constantinople.² In regard to Eusebius of Dorylæum, Julian of Cos, and the clergy of Constantinople, who had remained faithful to Flavian, Leo repeats what he had already said in his letter to Pulcheria, and closes with the request that this letter of his should be generally made known.

The fourth letter, which Leo signed on the 13th April 451, and gave to the envoys of Anatolius, was addressed to Julian

¹ That is, they received again their sees and ministered again in their churches, but they were still excluded from intercourse with the other bishops, and from participation in Synods and the like. Cf. Quesnel's note 1 in this place (printed in Baller. t. ii. p. 1462 sq., and Morin. *Exercit. Eccles.* lib. ii. *Exercit.* 17, 18, 19).

² Dioscurus, Juvenal, Thalassius of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Eustathius of Berytus, etc., were the heads of the Robber-Synod. The latter distinguished himself at it by misunderstanding the words of Cyril and expressly declaring, that "after the Incarnation there was only one nature to be acknowledged." Cf. above, p. 246

of Cos (*Epist.* 81), and speaks first of the great dangers to which Julian had been exposed on account of his adherence to orthodoxy. For this reason, he had been forced to flee to Rome, and it had been pleasant to the Pope to be able to speak with him. But it was still better that now the times had changed in favour of orthodoxy and of Julian, and that he could live in the East again in freedom and without danger. He heard with pleasure that most of the misguided bishops now wished to return again to Church communion; some, however, were obstinate, and must be treated with severity. His legates, whom he would send to the East, would in this matter arrange what was proper with Julian. — For some reason unknown to us, the sending of these new legates was delayed until June, and the envoys of Anatolius returned alone with the four letters which have just been mentioned.¹

About the same time Leo received a new letter from the Emperor, which was brought to him by Tatian, the prefect of the city, but which is now lost. The Pope answered this on the 23d of April 451, and first of all bestowed great commendation upon the zeal of the Emperor, and then adds: "It would not be right to respond to the demand of a few fools, and give occasion for new disputations and allow a new inquiry to be made as to whether the doctrine of Eutyches were heretical or not, and whether Dioscurus had rightly judged or not (at the Synod which was to be held). The most of those who had gone astray had already found their way back, and had asked for pardon. Therefore they must not now consider the question as to what was the true faith, but which of those who had erred should have favour shown to them, and in what way it should be shown. Therefore he would more fully communicate to the Emperor, who was so anxious for a Synod, his view on this subject by the new legates who would soon arrive."²

These new legates were sent by Leo after the former ones, Abundius and the others, had returned, and had brought with them another letter from the Emperor, which is now lost.³ To the new legates he gave four letters, dated June 9

¹ Cf. note 7 of the Ballerini on *Epist.* 78, and their note 5 on *Ep.* 81.

² *Epist.* 82, p. 1043 sqq., in Mansi, t. vi. p. 112.

³ We see this from the beginning of his *Epist.* 83.

(probably the day of their departure from Rome), to Marcian, Pulcheria, Anatolius, and Julian of Cos, which, like the earlier letters, are not without significance for the preliminary history of the Council of Chalcedon.¹

In his letter to the Emperor, Leo gives a brief review of what he (the Emperor) had already done for the good of the Church, and then he adds: In order to cleanse all the provinces of the empire from the heresy, as had been done in the capital, he sent the bishop Lucentius, and the priest Basil, as legates in the East, in order to complete the restoration of the penitent members of the Robber-Synod to communion with Anatolius, and these legates he commended to the Emperor. He had himself desired the holding of a Synod of which the Emperor spoke; but the necessity of the present time did not allow the meeting of bishops, since those very provinces whose bishops were most necessary for the Synod (the Western) were at present greatly afflicted by war (by Attila), and could not dispense with their shepherds. The Emperor might therefore put off the holding of the Synod to a more peaceful time. On this subject his legates would speak further.² Leo wrote much the same to Pulcheria, but in addition he entreated her to have Eutyches removed from the neighbourhood of Constantinople (from his monastery) to a more remote place, so that he might not easily have intercourse with those whom he had misled. At the same time she should give orders that a Catholic abbot should be appointed to the monastery of which Eutyches had been the head, in order to deliver this community from false doctrine.³

¹ Leonis *Epp.* 83, 84, 85, 86, p. 1045 sqq., ed. Baller. t. i.; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 114 sqq.

² *Epist.* 83, in Baller. *l.c.* p. 1046; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 114 sqq.

³ *Epist.* 84, p. 1048. That Eutyches had still many adherents, particularly among the monks of his convent, is proved by the complaint which Faustus and many other archimandrites at this time forwarded to the Emperor. They complained that these people had yielded no obedience to the exhortations of Anatolius and his Synod. The Emperor should therefore permit that they should be treated according to the monastic rules, and should correct themselves in accordance with these or be subjected to greater punishment. The Emperor was also asked to permit the archimandrites to arrange what was necessary in the hole in which they lived (Eutyches' convent), i.e. appoint a Catholic abbot. Mansi, t. vii. p. 76; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 423.

Leo requested Bishop Anatolius of Constantinople, in common with the papal legates, to arrange all that was advantageous to the Church (in reference to the restoration of those who had fallen away). In this it should be a leading rule, that all former members of the Robber-Synod should be required to pronounce an anathema upon Eutyches, his doctrine, and his adherents. With respect to those who had been most seriously implicated, the Apostolic see reserved the decision, and Anatolius should not, without this, allow the names of such persons to be read in the church.¹—Finally, the Pope requests Bishop Julian of Cos in all ways to support his legates, as they also had received a commission to act steadily in communion with Julian.²

SEC. 185. *The Emperor Marcian summons an Œcumenical Council. The Pope assents, and nominates Legates.*

When Leo wrote these last letters, the Emperor had already, on the 17th of May 451, in his own name and in that of his co-Emperor, summoned an Œcumenical Council to Nicæa, which was to open on the 1st of September of the current year.³ The edict is addressed to the metropolitans, and is as follows: "That which concerns the true faith and the orthodox religion is to be preferred to everything else. For if God is gracious to us, then our Empire will be firmly established. Since now

¹ *Epist.* 85, in Baller. *l.c.* p. 1050; Mansi, t. vi. p. 118. A second letter to Anatolius, dated June 19, 451, recommends two priests to him, but contributes nothing to the preliminary history of the Council of Chalcedon.

² *Epist.* 86, Baller. *l.c.* p. 1052; Mansi, t. vi. p. 119.

³ "When Marcian put forth this summons, he had not yet received the representations of Leo to a contrary effect, for the envoys who had been commissioned to convey them did not depart from Rome until the beginning of June 451, whilst the edicts of convocation had been issued at Constantinople in May. If the Emperor had been more accurately acquainted with the views of the Pope on the subject, he might probably have been induced to desist from his purpose; as, however, he knew nothing of this, he was therefore bound to believe that, in accordance with the previous views of Leo, he was only doing what he wished. It is probable that the still divided condition of the Church in the East aroused in him the desire to assemble an Œcumenical Council, and thereby conclusively and thoroughly to put an end to the disturbances, embarrassments, and dissensions which, in spite of all the pains which had been taken on the subject, were not yet put an end to."—Arendt, *Leo d. Gr.* S. 264.

doubt has arisen respecting the true faith, as is shown by the letters of the most holy Bishop of Rome, Leo, we have resolved that a holy Council shall be held at Nicæa in Bithynia, so that, by consent of all, the truth may be proved, and that without passion the true faith may be more clearly declared, so that no doubt and no disturbance of unity may for the future take place. Therefore your holiness is required to attend at Nicæa on the next 1st of September, together with such members as you may think fit of devoted, wise, and orthodox bishops. We shall ourselves, unless we are prevented by any warlike expeditions, be present in person at the venerable Synod."—This edict of convocation is still preserved to us in two copies,¹ of which the one is addressed to no particular metropolitan, the other to Anatolius of Constantinople. The latter bears the date of the 17th, or, according to the old Latin translation, the 23d of May.

On hearing of this summons, Leo again addressed a letter, June 24, 451, to the Emperor Marcian, at the beginning of which he expresses his dissatisfaction with what has been done in the words: "I thought that your grace would have been able to comply with my wish to postpone the Synod to a more convenient time out of regard to the present pressure, so that bishops from all provinces might be present, and thus form a really Ecumenical Council. But since from love to the Catholic faith you wish this assembly to be held now, in order to offer no impediment to your pious will, I have chosen as my representative my fellow-bishop Paschasinus (of Lilybræum, now Marsala, in Sicily), whose province appears to be less disquieted by war, and have joined with him the priest Boniface. These two, together with the previous legates (at Constantinople), the bishop Lucentius and the presbyter Basil, and Julian of Cos, shall form the representatives of the papal see at the Synod, and in particular, Paschasinus shall there preside in my place."²

¹ Printed in Mansi, t. vi. pp. 551 and 553; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 45 sq.

² *Epist.* 89, p. 1060, t. i. ed. Baller.; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 125 sqq. Perthel says, in his monograph on Leo I. (Jena, 1843, S. 71): "The Emperor is requested in this letter to assign the presidency at the Synod to Paschasinus."

The document in which Leo appoints Paschasinus as first legate no longer exists;¹ but we still possess a letter of Leo's to Paschasinus, also dated June 24, 451, saying that the Pope sent to him his *Epistola dogmatica* and some other patristic documents, which he had also entrusted to his previous envoys to Constantinople (*in causa Anatolii*), so that he might be more accurately informed on the subject in question. To this he adds a short instruction on heresy in regard to Eutyches, and declares that the whole Church of Constantinople, together with the convents and many bishops, had agreed to his doctrinal letter, and had subscribed an anathema on Nestorius and Eutyches. Nay more, according to the most recent letter from Anatolius, the Bishop of Antioch² had sent round Leo's letter to all his bishops, and in common with them had declared his agreement with it, and the repudiation of Nestorius and Eutyches. Finally, the Pope gives him the commission, not belonging, however, to this subject, to examine, along with men who understood the matter, the day on which Easter should be held in 455, as the Easter reckoning of Theophilus (of Alexandria) for this year was erroneous.³

Two days later, on the 26th of June 451, Leo wrote again to the Emperor Marcian that "he had indeed wished that the Synod, which he had himself desired, and which the Emperor had judged necessary, for the pacification of the Eastern Church, should be held later; as, however, the Emperor, from religious zeal, was hastening the matter, he would not oppose it, but he prayed and most solemnly adjured the Emperor that he would not allow the ancient faith to be brought into question at the Synod, and old condemned propositions to be

This is incorrect. There is nothing in the letter of a request or an assignment (by the Emperor). It says: *Prædictum fratrem et coepiscopum meum vice mea Synodo convenit præsidere*, and Peter de Marca is quite right when he asserts that the right of the papal legate to preside did not depend upon the will of the Emperor. *De concord. sacerdot. et imp. lib. v. 6.*

¹ Cf. note 4 of the Ballerini on *Epist.* 89.

² This was Maximus, who had been put in the place of Domnus, and had been ordained by Anatolius. Even Pope Leo recognized him later. Cf. Leonis *Epp.* 104, 119.

³ Leonis *Epist.* 88, t. i. p. 1057, ed. Baller.; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 123.

renewed ; but would see that the definitions of the Synod of Nicæa remained in force.”¹

In a letter to Anatolius, dated on the same day, Leo expresses his astonishment that so short an interval had been allowed for the assembling of the Synod. How could he transmit the intelligence respecting it, in proper time, into all the provinces (of the West), so that a truly Œcumenical Council might take place ? In order, however, not to act in opposition to the Emperor, he had already appointed legates for the Synod, and he tells Anatolius their names.²

In a third letter, also dated June 26, Leo gave a commission to Bishop Julian of Cos to represent the Pope at the Synod now summoned to meet at Nicæa, in union with the other legates.³ At last he despatched himself *sub eodem* a letter to the Synod which had been convoked, in which he says : “ Since it is agreeable to God to show mercy to the penitent, the decision of the Emperor to convoke a Synod for the warding off of the wiles of Satan, and for the restoration of the peace of the Church, should be thankfully acknowledged. In this he had preserved the right and distinction of the Apostle Peter, and had asked the Pope for his personal presence at this assembly. But this was permitted neither by the necessity of the times nor by previous custom. His legates, however, would preside in his place, and he would in that way, although not in bodily form, be present. As the Synod knew (from his *Epistola dogmatica*) what he believed to be in accordance with the ancient tradition, they could not doubt as to what he wished. No opposition to the true faith should be allowed at the Synod ; as the true faith in regard to the Incarnation of Christ, in accordance with apostolic teaching, was fully set forth in his letter to Flavian.⁴ It must also be a special business of the Synod to

¹ *Epist.* 90, in Baller. *l.c.* p. 1063 ; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 127 sqq.

² *Epist.* 91, in Baller. *l.c.* p. 1065 ; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 129.

³ *Epist.* 92, in Baller. *l.c.* p. 1066 ; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 130.

⁴ As Leo was convinced, and with justice, that his letter to Flavian contained the true doctrine, so he was bound to wish that the Synod should receive it, and not dispute against the truth. But he did not wish in this way to withdraw from individual bishops the right of personal examination, as he says expressly in his letter (120) to Theodoret of Cyrus : *The auctoritas summorum* (i.e. of the

assist those bishops to regain their rights who had been unjustly persecuted and deposed on account of their resistance to heresy. The resolutions of the earlier Synod of Ephesus under Cyril must remain in force, and the Nestorian heresy must gain no advantage from the condemnation of the Eutychian."¹

It has been wondered why Leo no longer declares urgent the Synod which had been previously so earnestly desired by him—why, in fact, he perhaps no longer wished it to be held. Various motives have been attributed to him on this subject, as though he had some doubts as to the presidency of the Synod, and perhaps also had thought that his *Epistola dogmatica* was now near to being universally received, and to attaining high authority, as was the case in former times with some of the writings of Cyril; and that the Synod might perhaps diminish the consideration in which his doctrinal letter was held.²—The matter can, however, be explained quite naturally and easily in the following manner:

(a) At the time when Leo desired a Synod in Italy, orthodoxy had been brought into doubt by the falling away of most of the bishops of the Byzantine Empire. A great Synod was therefore needed to set forth the true doctrine of the Person of Christ.

(b) Since the change in the throne, however, almost all the bishops of the East who had previously erred, had again returned in penitence to the communion of the Church, had pronounced anathema on Eutychianism and Nestorianism, and had agreed to the famous doctrinal letter of the Pope. Thus orthodoxy was secured, and the principal question solved, and the chief ground removed, for the convocation of a new Synod (cf. above, p. 267 f.).

(c) Only the secondary point still remained: the complete reconciliation of the penitent bishops and the punishment of the obstinate. This matter could be arranged by the papal

Pope) must be so preserved that the liberty of the inferiors shall not be abridged (*ut in nullo inferiorum putetur imminuta libertas*). Cf. Baller. t. i. p. 1220, and their note 14.

¹ *Epist.* 93, p. 1067 sqq. ed. Baller.; in Hardouin, t. ii. p. 47; Mansi, t. vi. p. 131 sqq.

² Walch, *l.c.* S. 324; Perthel, *Papst Leo's Leben und Lehren*, Jena, 1843, S. 69.

legates at Constantinople, in union with Anatolius, and with the support of the Emperor, without a Synod.

(d) If, however, a new Synod, and that in the East, should assemble, Leo feared nothing from the Eutychians, but something from the Nestorians, since a good many bishops of Syria were still suspected of Nestorianism. Leo was afraid that they, or others in their name, would take advantage of the rejection of Eutychianism, and would originate a new discussion on orthodoxy in favour of Nestorianism. That this was his chief fear, is clear especially from his 93d letter (see p. 281). And in order to remove this danger, he repeats so often in his letters to the Emperor and the Empress, that the faith must in no wise again be called in question at the Synod.

(e) This fear lay the nearer to the Pope that at this very time, in the year 451, the Latin kingdom was seriously harassed by the migration of nations and by wars (Attila), and therefore but few Latin bishops could come to the Synod. From this cause its chief supports and those of orthodoxy would be wanting, in opposition both to Nestorianism and to Eutychianism. How easily misled, however, and how uncertain in doctrine, many Greek bishops were, the Robber-Synod had already more than sufficiently shown. The desire of the Pope, that the Synod should be held in the West, that is, should be attended by many Latin bishops, was therefore quite legitimate, and dictated by his interest in orthodoxy.

(f) At the same time it is not to be forgotten that from a Synod in the Byzantine Empire, there was to be feared a derangement of the relative positions of bishops established by the sixth canon of Nicaea, not as though the Bishop of Byzantium would now have wished to be raised above the Bishop of Rome, but because, since the second Œcumenical Council, Constantinople had often endeavoured to take precedence of the ancient patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch, and to place himself immediately by the side of the Bishop of Rome—an assumption which the Pope, in his own interest and in that of the other ancient patriarchs, was bound to resist. That Leo had in fact given his legates instructions in reference to this point, we shall presently see.

In the month of July 451, the papal legates already mentioned took their journey from Rome, and Leo gave them letters of commendation to the Emperor and the Empress, dated July 20, 451. In both he speaks again of his having wished for a Synod in Italy, and that it should be held at a later time; in order, however, to respond to the imperial zeal, he had nominated legates for the approaching Synod. In the letter to Pulcheria he expresses also with considerable fulness his view, with which we are acquainted, as to the forgiveness to be extended to the penitent bishops.¹

The special instruction which Leo gave to his legates has been lost, and we find only two fragments of it preserved in the transactions of the Synod of Chalcedon. In the first session of the Synod, the papal legate, Bishop Paschasius declared: "We have a command from the apostolic Bishop of Rome, who is the head of all the churches. It is there ordered that Dioscurus shall have no seat in the assembly."²—The second fragment is embodied in the Acts of the 16th session of Chalcedon, where the papal legate, the priest Boniface, read from his instructions the words: "The decision of the holy fathers (at Nicæa in regard to the rank of the great metropolitans) you must in no wise allow to be interfered with, and you must in every way preserve and defend my prerogative in your person. And if any, presuming upon the importance of their cities, should try to arrogate anything to themselves, you must resist this with all steadfastness."³

In accordance with the imperial command, many bishops had come to Nicæa in the summer of 451, but Marcian himself, through war and other hindrances, was prevented from appearing in person, and therefore, in a letter (without date) which still exists in Latin, he prayed the assembled fathers to have patience and to postpone the proceedings, until it should be possible for him to arrive, as he hoped soon to do.⁴ It was probably about the same time that Pulcheria gave the governor

¹ *Epist.* 94, 95, in Baller. *l.c.* p. 1075 sqq.; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 135 sqq.

² *Concil. Chalced.* Act i. in Mansi, t. vi. pp. 580, 581; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 63.

³ Mansi, t. vii. p. 443; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 633. On both fragments cf. the dissertation of the Ballerini *De epistolis deperditis* in the first volume of their edition of the *Works of Leo*, 1450, 1451.

⁴ Mansi, t. vi. p. 553 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 47.

of Bithynia the command, that as very many bishops had already arrived at Nicæa, and she herself hoped soon to be able to appear in person, he should in the meantime remove from the city those clerics, monks, and laymen who were neither summoned by the court to the city, nor were brought with them by their bishops, but appeared to have come of their own accord, to excite disorder.¹

As, however, the arrival of the Emperor and Empress was still longer delayed, the assembled bishops addressed a letter to Marcian, in which they informed him how painful this was for them, and especially for the weak and sickly among them. In consequence of this the Emperor commanded the transference of the Synod to Chalcedon, and therefore wrote to the bishops: "As the delay fell so heavily upon them, and as the legates of the Pope awaited his personal presence, and made their own arrival at Nicæa dependent upon it, the bishops might, if they pleased, remove to Chalcedon, because this was so near the capital that he could attend in person both to the business in Constantinople and to that of the Council."² In a second letter of the 22d of September 451,³ the Emperor requested the bishops to hasten their departure for Chalcedon, assuring them that, in spite of the recent occurrences in Illyria (invasions of that province by the Huns), he would be present at the Synod, and dispelled any doubt they might have, lest, from the nearness of Chalcedon to Constantinople, they should there be in danger from the adherents of Eutyches.⁴

¹ In Mansi, t. vi. p. 556; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 48.

² In Mansi, t. vi. p. 557; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 49. Like many other imperial decrees, this was probably published in Latin and in Greek at the same time, and the Ballerini believed that they had discovered the Latin original in a Vatican Codex (No. 1322), whilst hitherto only the Greek text with a Latin translation was known. Baller. edit. *Opp. S. Leonis*, t. ii. p. 1218.

³ This date is given only in the old Latin translation of the document. If it is genuine, it is probable that even before the 1st of September (on which day the Synod had to be opened) many bishops had arrived at Nicæa; for there certainly elapsed a considerable interval between their arrival and this new letter from the Emperor.

⁴ In Mansi, t. vi. p. 560; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 52.

BOOK XI.

THE FOURTH CECUMENICAL SYNOD AT CHALCEDON, A.D. 451.¹

SEC. 186. *Number and Place of the Sessions.*

AFTER these preparations the Council of Chalcedon, which had been summoned by the Emperor Marcian at the suggestion, and with the subsequent consent, of Pope Leo the Great (see above, p. 265 f. and p. 278), was opened on the 8th of October 451, and it lasted till the 1st of November of the same year, inclusive. As to the number of sessions held during those three weeks, even in ancient times there was no agreement, either in the existing copies of the synodal Acts themselves, or among the historians who refer to this

¹ The literature respecting the Council of Chalcedon is rich, and so early as the sixth century, the Church historian Evagrius treated of this Synod in his *Historia Eccles.* lib. ii. c. 2, 4, 18; also Bishop Faecundus of Hermiane in Africa, in his work *Pro defensione trium capitulorum*, lib. v. c. 3, 4, and lib. viii. c. 4 (in Galland. *Biblioth. PP.* t. xi. p. 713 sqq.), and the Carthaginian archdeacon Liberatus, in his *Breviarium causæ Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum*, c. 13 (in Galland. *l.c.* t. xii. p. 142 sqq.). To the more recent literature respecting the Synod of Chalcedon belong: (1) Baron. *Annal.* ad ann. 451, n. 55 sqq. (2) Richer, *Hist. Concil. general.* lib. i. c. 8. (3) Tillemont, *Mémoires* etc., t. xv. p. 628 sqq. in the article on S. Leo the Great. (4) Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccl.* sec. v. t. v. p. 64 sqq. and p. 209 sqq. ed. Venet. 1778. (5) Du Pin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* etc. t. iv. pp. 327-366. (6) Remi Ceillier, *Histoire des auteurs sacrés*, t. xiv. p. 651 sqq. (7) Quesnel, *Synopsis Actorum Concilii Chalced.* in his *Dissert. de vita etc. S. Leonis* in the ed. of Ballerini of S. Leo's Works (t. ii. p. 501 sqq.). (8) Hülsemann, *Exercitat. ad Concil. Chalcedon.* Lips. 1651. (9) Cave, *Historia Litteraria* etc. 311 sqq. ed. Genev. 1705. (10) Benzeli *Vindiciæ Concilii Chalcedon. contra Gothofred. Arnold.* 1739 and 1745. (11) Bower, *History of the Popes*, var. edd. and in German, by Rambach, vol. ii. (12) Van Espen, *Commentar. in canones et decreta juris veteris* etc. Colon. 1755, pp. 209-258. (13) Walch, *Ketzerhistorie*, Bd. vi. S. 329 ff. (14) Walch, *Histoire der Kirchenversammlungen*, S. 307 ff. (15) Arendt, *Papst Leo der Grosse*, Mainz, 1835, S. 267-322. (16) Dörner, *Lehre von der Person Christi*, 1853, 2te Aufl. 2ter Theil, 1 Abtheilung, S. 117 ff.

Synod. Many old manuscripts contained only the first six sessions, which treated the question of faith, and have special reference, as we shall see, to the character of an Œcumenical Council. Other manuscripts added to these in a seventh session the canons or disciplinary arrangements of our Synod; others again were more complete, and contained also the transactions referring to personal and special subjects, which came to be discussed in the later sessions. But even among manuscripts of the last kind there is again a great difference, since none of them contains the whole of the special transactions, and in one certain parts are wanting, and in others others.¹

A similar want of agreement is found among the old historians. Evagrius numbers fifteen sessions (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 18), Liberatus, who had before him an Alexandrian manuscript of the Synodal Acts, divided (c. 13) the whole into twelve *Secretaria* with sixteen *Actiones*, so that to him, as well as to Evagrius, several of the transactions on special subjects had remained unknown; for example, those on Photius of Tyre and on Carosus. The ordinary division, and that which has also been received universally in the West, since the work of the Roman deacon Rusticus, of which we shall have to speak presently (p. 292), makes sixteen sessions; and this division we must also retain, although the Ballerini long ago correctly remarked that properly twenty-one sessions should be counted, which were held on fourteen (according to the Latin Acts, thirteen) different days. The result of our examination on this point, as to the number, time of holding, and object of the particular sessions, we give, with some variations, from the brothers Ballerini, in the following table, p. 287.

The whole of the sessions were held in the Church of S. Euphemia the Martyr, which was situated in front of the town on the Bosporus, only two stadia or twelve hundred paces from it, on a gentle slope opposite Constantinople, and offered a magnificent view over the sea and the fields. Evagrius has a whole chapter (ii. 3) devoted to the description of this beautiful church and to the miracles which were often repeated

¹ Cf. the note of the Ballerini in t. ii. p. 501 of their edition of the *Works of Leo the Great*.

Day of each Session.	Object of each Session.	Number of each Session, according to the ordinary reckoning.	Correct Numbers.
Oct. 8, 451,	Inquiry respecting Dioscurus, and reading of the earlier Acts,	1	1
Oct. 10,	The Creeds of Nicæa and Constantinople, two letters of Cyril, and the <i>Epistola dogmatica</i> of Leo are read,	2	2
Oct. 13,	Deposition of Dioscurus,	3	3
Oct. 17,	Reception of the letter of Leo. Admission of Juvenal of Jerusalem and other former assistants of Dioscurus. Transactions respecting the Egyptian bishops. Memorial of several archimandrites,	4	4
Oct. 20,	Transactions respecting Carosus and Dorotheus,	Appendix to Session 4	5
<i>Eodem</i> ,	Transactions respecting Photius of Tyre,	Do.	6
Oct. 22,	Sketch of a decree concerning the faith by a synodal committee (in an oratory), and general confirmation of the same,	5	7
Oct. 25,	Presence of the Emperor. The decree concerning the faith approved in the former session is solemnly read and subscribed. The Emperor proposes some canons,	6	8
Oct. 26,	Transactions respecting the patriarchal provinces of Antioch and Jerusalem,	7	9
<i>Eodem</i> ,	Theodoret of Cyrus is declared justified,	8	10
Oct. 27	Transactions respecting Bishop Ibas of Edessa,	9	11
(according to the Latin, 26),			
Oct. 28	Continuation of proceedings respecting Ibas,	10	12
(Lat. 27),			
Oct. 27 (Lat.),	Transactions respecting the deposed Domnus of Antioch (extant only in Latin),	Appendix to Session 10	13
Oct. 29,	Quarrel between Bassianus and Stephen of Ephesus,	11	14
Oct. 30,	Resolution to elect a new Bishop of Ephesus,	12	15
<i>Eodem</i> ,	Decision of the quarrel between the Bishops of Nicæa and Nicomedia,	13	16
Oct. 31,	The question as to whether Sabinian or Athanasius is the rightful Bishop of Perrha, is to be examined by an Antiochene patriarchal Synod,	14	17
<i>Eodem</i> ,	Reading of <i>Epist.</i> 33 of Leo (known only from Ballerini, t. i. p. 1490),	Formerly wanting.	18
<i>Eodem</i> ,	Confirmation of the agreement which Maximus of Antioch had made with Juvenal of Jerusalem and with Domnus (known only from Ballerini, t. ii. p. 1227 sqq.),	Formerly wanting.	19
<i>Eodem</i> ,	Drawing up of the Canons (the Ballerini transfer this to the seventh session),	15	20
Nov. 1,	Protest of the papal legates against Canon 28. Close of the Synod,	16	21

in it; and Baronius, who borrowed this, adds still more from Paulinus of Nola (*ad ann.* 451, n. 60). But when he maintains that the members of the Synod had their seats in the presbytery of this church, he is in this led astray by a false reading in his copy of Liberatus' *Breviarium* (c. 13). Baronius read: *Adveniens Marcianus imperator ad Secretarium cum iudicibus* etc. He knew quite well that by *Secretarium* was generally understood a building attached to a church, and that many Synods had taken place in such Secretaria (see above, p. 163). But as the Acts of Chalcedon say expressly that the bishops were seated near the altar, Baronius thought himself obliged on this occasion to consider the expression *Secretarium* as identical with *Sanctuarium*, and to refer it to the presbytery. But the genuine text of Liberatus removes all difficulty. It runs thus: *Sexto autem Secretario adveniens Marcianus imperator ad concilium cum iudicibus*, etc.; that is, "Marcian appeared at the sixth session (for in this sense, as we saw (p. 286), Liberatus uses the word *Secretarium*) of the Council."¹ But as the number of the members of the Synod extended to about six hundred, it is probable that so large a multitude would better find space in the nave and aisles of the church than in the presbytery.²

SEC. 187. *The Synodal Acts and the Translations of them.*

The Acts of the Synod of Chalcedon, which are given most fully by Mansi in the sixth and seventh folio volumes of his great collection of the Councils (and somewhat less fully by Hardouin, t. ii.), are very numerous and extensive, and are divided into three parts, in accordance with the usual division adopted since the Roman edition of the Councils, of the year 1608: (1) The Acts which have reference to the Council of Chalcedon; but to this are prefixed, for example, the letters of Pope Leo, and of the Emperors Theodosius II. and Marcian (these are the documents of which we have already made very frequent use). (2) The minutes of the sessions at Chalcedon, with a great many supplements which had been read there. To

¹ In Galland. *Biblioth. PP.* t. xii. p. 143.

² Cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. xv. p. 916, note 44 *Sur S. Leon.*

these belong particularly the Acts of the Synod under Flavian in the year 448 and those of the Robber-Synod. (3) Documents which refer to the period which followed immediately upon the Synod of Chalcedon and its ratification. Into this third part Mansi has also woven that collection of letters which under the name of *Codex encyclicus* forms a special appendix to the Acts of the Synod, and which will be more particularly discussed by us later on. The Ballerini in their edition of Leo's works (t. i. p. 1491 sqq., t. ii. p. 1223 sqq., t. iii. pp. 213 sqq. and 518) and Mansi (t. vii. p. 773 sqq.) have given some further documents relating to our Synod.

Whether a properly *official collection* of these Acts, particularly of the principal documents and synodal protocols, was given is doubtful. Baluze and others deny it, and are of opinion that as each of the bishops of highest importance had his own notaries, each one would therefore cause a special collection to be compiled for himself. The fact that even in early times, in the various manuscripts, the particular minutes of the sessions were separately arranged and numbered, they think is only explained by the acceptance of these diverse semi-official collections. This is true; but, on the other hand, (1) all these copies give one and the same text, which would not be possible if they were derived from different shorthand writers; (2) the different arrangement of particular documents cannot be explained simply by an original difference in the Acts, but must also have a secondary difference, arising from the transcribers; besides, (3) the Synod itself, in its letter to Pope Leo, says: "It has communicated to the Pope *πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τῶν πεπραγμένων* for the purpose of ratification."¹ This presupposes an *official collection* of the Acts; but it might not yet have been complete, for soon afterwards, in March 453, Leo commissioned his Nuntius in Constantinople, Bishop Julian of Cos, to arrange a complete collection of the Acts of the Synod, and to translate them into Latin.² We see from this that Pope Leo also wished to secure an official collection.

Most of the documents in question, particularly the minutes

¹ In Mansi, t. vi. p. 155; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 659; and in the Ballerini edition of Leo's works, t. i. p. 1099.

² Leonis *Epist.* 113, in Baller. t. i. p. 1194; in Mansi, t. vi. p. 220.

of the sessions, are drawn up in Greek, others are in both Greek and Latin, for example, the imperial letters; while others again, like the papal letters, have only a Latin original. All the Greek documents were translated into Latin, and many of the Latin into Greek. Nearly all these translations come down from ancient times, many from that of the Synod itself. Only the Latin translation of the transactions relative to Carosus and Photius (fourth session) were first made by the Roman editors in 1608. By means of the old Latin translations some portions of the synodal transactions have been preserved which were unfortunately lost in the Greek original. For example, those respecting Domnus of Antioch at the close of the tenth session, and the ratification of the agreement between the patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem in the fourteenth session. Moreover, these translations, since they were partly made from very old and good manuscripts, also furnish the opportunity of here and there correcting the Greek text by their help. Most of these Latin translations, before the Greek documents were accessible to us, were already more or less fully printed in the Collections of the Councils by Merlin, Crabbe, Surius, Nicolinus, and Severin Binius. The first persons who also edited the Greek text were the scholars whose duty it was to draw up the Roman collection of Councils of 1608, particularly the celebrated Jesuit Sirmond; and from that time forth the text derived from Greek manuscripts passed into all later collections. In some of these use was further made of some codices not known to the Roman editors, particularly in the collection of Hardouin, yet it is to be wished that a new edition of the Greek text should be prepared, and many manuscripts, already enumerated by Fabricius, but not yet collated, would render good service in this work.¹

With regard to the Latin translation of the Acts of Chalcedon, the question first arises, Who was its author? and Quesnel had no hesitation in attributing the authorship to those persons whom, as we have seen, Bishop Julian of Cos had to employ at the command of Leo. Yet that this is not correct,

¹ On the *Codex Cus.* No. 57 at Vienna, and on other codices of the Acts of Chalcedon, or of single documents respecting it, cf. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, ed. Harless, t. xii. p. 650.

Baluze and the Ballerini have emphatically pointed out, and they have proved that the translation in question must be at least fifty years later in date than Julian of Cos, and perhaps originated with Dionysius Exiguus, whose translation of the canons of Chalcedon is adopted in our *versio antiqua*. It also remains undecided whether Julian of Cos ever really furnished the translation required of him or not. As the Ballerini have found Latin translations of some of the documents of Chalcedon which are decidedly older than our *versio antiqua* (a version of the minutes of the sixth session, and of the transactions relating to Domnus of Antioch, as well as the agreement between the patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem), it may perhaps be assumed that Julian had at first translated only some of the most important Acts, and that some circumstance prevented the completion of the whole. But about the middle of the sixth century the Roman deacon Rusticus, when he was at Constantinople with his uncle, Pope Vigilius, in the years 549 and 550, prepared a correction of the *versio antiqua*, comparing it with several Greek manuscripts of the Acts of Chalcedon, particularly with those of the monastery of the Acoimetæ.¹ He says this himself repeatedly in the annotations which he appended at the close of the minutes of the first, fourth (of the *Actio de Caroso* etc.), fifth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, and fourteenth sessions,² and it only remains undecided whether the monastery of the Acoimetæ, of which he speaks, and to which the codices belonged, was the well-known one at Constantinople or the less famed one at Chalcedon. Baluze decides in favour of the latter, on the ground of the note which Rusticus added at the end of the minutes of the first session.³ But what the

¹ [An order of monks (*ἀκοιμηταί*, the "sleepless"). Cf. Suicer, *s.h.v.*]

² In Mansi, t. vi. p. 938, t. vii. pp. 79, 118, 183, 194, 203 sqq.; in Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 243, 431, 455, 495, 502, 507 sqq.; in Baluzii *Nova Collectio Concil.* pp. 1165, 1251, 1258, 1285, 1291, 1296; also printed in Mansi, t. vii. p. 707. Also made clear by the declaration of Rusticus himself, that he did not merely compare the minutes of the first session and correct them, as Quesnel supposed, in Baller., edit. *Opp. S. Leonis*, t. ii. p. 1519. Cf. Baluz. *l.c.* p. 971, n. 22, and Mansi, t. vii. p. 661, n. 22.

³ Baluz. *l.c.*, in the *Præf.* to his restoration of the *versio antiqua*, p. 971, n. 21; also printed in Mansi, t. vii. p. 661, n. 21.

Roman deacon accomplished by his comparison and correction is the following:—(a) In the places in the *versio antiqua* touched on, he remarked where and how the Greek codices used by him differ from one another altogether or in part, and he appended these variations, which were frequently great, to the existing Latin text; (b) he arranged and numbered the particular minutes of the sessions according to the order found in the Greek copies; in particular, what was in the *versio antiqua* the second *Actio* was made the third, and inversely, and the canons which stand after the sixth session were transferred to the fifteenth; (c) he translated anew the transactions of the seventh session respecting the agreement between Antioch and Jerusalem, although the *versio antiqua* already had this document, and omitted from it one little sentence: *Qua interlocutione . . . mox sequentia*, which is now supplied to us from the *antiqua*.¹

From this point there were partly manuscripts which contained the uncorrected *versio antiqua*, and partly others which reproduced the edition of Rusticus. Of the former only two copies are still existing—a codex in Paris, and one at Rome which formerly belonged to Queen Christina, whilst the work of Rusticus is still extant in a great many manuscripts which also vary much from one another.²

The *versio antiqua* corrected by Rusticus was printed for the first time in the years 1538 and 1557, in the two editions of the Councils by the Franciscan Crabbe (in Mechlin), and thence it passed into the editions of Surius, Nicolinus, and into the first of Binius (1606). The editors of the Roman collection of Councils of 1608 have, on the other hand, after due consideration, altered this translation here and there, in order to make it correspond with the Greek text which they edited for the first time, and this altered *versio Rustici* passed into the subsequent editions of Binius as well as into the *regia* and that of Labbe.³ But soon after the appearance of the

¹ The new translation of this document by Rusticus is to be found in Hardouin, t. ii. p. 491 sq.; Mansi, t. vii. p. 178 sq.; while the translation of the *versio antiqua* is found in Baluz. l.c. p. 1285, and in Mansi, t. vii. p. 731.

² Cf. the note of the Ballerini, t. ii. pp. 1518, 1519.

³ Cf. vol. i. p. 68 of our *History of the Councils*.

latter, Baluze, with extraordinary industry, and by comparing all the codices accessible to him, endeavoured again to discover the genuine text of the *versio antiqua* and the genuine form of the emendation of Rusticus, and he published the result of these studies in his *Nova Collectio Conciliorum*, pp. 953-1398, which formed a supplementary volume to the collection of Labbe, and appeared in Paris in 1683 (often printed subsequently, and in 1707). But from motives of economy he did not have the entire text printed, as after his researches he should have done, but gave only an outline or summary of all the particular portions of the Acts of Chalcedon, marking each portion only by the words at the beginning, and referring to the corresponding page in the edition of Labbe, where it had been already printed (according to the text of the Roman edition of 1608). He arranged that after this should follow the variations found in the different manuscripts as well from the original as from the amended *versio antiqua*, with frequent indications as to their value, and he further added all the annotations, corrections, and observations of Rusticus; so that we may learn from it the two different texts, both the purely *antiqua* and also the original form of the edition put forth by Rusticus. Moreover, he prefixed an excellent and very learned dissertation on the Latin translations of the Acts of Chalcedon.

This work, naturally, has not remained without influence upon the later collections and editions of the Acts of Councils. Hardouin, who began his comprehensive collection of Councils soon after the appearance of the work of Baluze (1685), generally speaking adopted the text of Labbe as the foundation of his own, and thus the text of the work of Rusticus as altered by the Roman editors, but he corrected it in numberless places in accordance with the results arrived at by Baluze, and at the same time, as it would appear, in consequence of a collation of particular manuscripts made by himself. Unfortunately he says nothing as to the manner in which he arrived at his Latin text of the Acts of Chalcedon, and even to the work of Baluze he makes no reference until p. 543 (vol. ii.), although he had used it throughout the whole

volume.¹ That he had done so, and that the text given by him was thus an improvement of the text of Labbe based upon Baluze, will be clear from a few proofs which I will adduce. T. ii. p. 54, Hardouin, after Baluze, gives correctly *SEXIES consule ordinario . . . Florentio*, while Labbe and even Mansi (t. vi. p. 563) incorrectly omit the *sexies*; only that Hardouin ought to have put the more correct *exconsule* instead of *consule*. Even in this case we see that Hardouin took the one correction from Baluze, and not the other. On the same page he further put *Nommo*, with Baluze, while Labbe and Mansi have *Monno*. On p. 67, line 9, he writes, with Baluze, *cum aliis viris*; and on the same page, line 13, he omits, after *Dioscurus*, the words *Alexandrinorum archiepiscopus*, and, on the other hand, retains *quibus censuit interloquendum*, although Baluze had not found this in any of his manuscripts.

In some respects Mansi made more use, and in some respects less, of the labours of Baluze, in his great edition of the Councils. Less in the sense that he never corrected the text from them, as Hardouin, at least here and there, had done, but simply repeated the text of Labbe; but, on the other hand, more, inasmuch as he printed literally in his collection the dissertation of Baluze on the old Latin translations of the Acts of Chalcedon (t. vii. p. 654 sqq.), borrowed the outline of the whole (at least partially), and also placed the variations collected by Baluze in the notes below the passages of the synodal documents to which they refer. (From t. vi. p. 541 to t. vii. p. 455, and in part, still further.) When, however, the notes of Baluze extend even to p. 627 of the seventh volume of Mansi, this arises from the fact, already noted p. 289, that Mansi amalgamated the so-called *Codex encyclicus* with the third part of the Acts of the Council, as the Roman editors had already done, and then also transferred to his collection the notes of Baluze belonging to this codex.

This *Codex encyclicus* is, however, nothing else but a col-

¹ Even in the Preface to vol. i. p. vi., where Hardouin enumerates the older collections of Councils, he does not mention the supplementary volume of Baluze; and although he acknowledges, p. vii. sqq. and p. xii., that he has borrowed much from Baluze and has made use of his examination of manuscripts, etc., he does not give the title of Baluze's work.

lection of letters made by command of the Emperor Leo, the successor of Marcian (457–474), which had been addressed, in the year 458, mostly by provincial Synods, to that Emperor in defence of the Council of Chalcedon against the attacks of the Monophysites. The proper *Corpus* of this collection consists of forty-one letters, and only to these is the title *Codex encyclicus* prefixed; but a kind of introduction to it is formed by four other letters; two from the Emperor Marcian and one each from the Empress Pulcheria and from Bishop Juvenal of Jerusalem, which already appear in the second part of the principal Acts. The Greek original of the forty-one letters, as well as of the letter of Juvenal, has been lost; but the Latin translation, which Cassiodorus, in the beginning of the sixth century, had prepared by his learned assistant Epiphanius Scholasticus, still exists, and was edited and revised by Baluze in the same way as the translation of the three parts of the principal Acts by Rusticus.¹ Mansi's predecessor Hardouin had acted differently (t. ii. p. 690 sqq.). He also made use of the labours of Baluze on the *Codex encycl.*, but he did not weave it into the *pars tertia* of the principal Acts, but retained it as a special whole: he only struck out those letters which are prefixed to the *Codex encycl.*, because he had already given them in the *pars tertia*, and for the sake of brevity omitted also the notes of Baluze and some other less important matter, e.g. the *Prefatio* of Epiphanius Scholasticus. He also retained the arrangement of the forty-one letters which the Roman editors had introduced.

SEC. 188. *The Imperial Commissioners and the Papal Legates. Presidency and Number of those present.*

As imperial commissioners (*ἀρχοντες* or *judices*²) at the Council of Chalcedon, there were present: The patrician and

¹ Baluzii *Nova Collectio Concil.* p. 1400 sqq. His preface to it, and the outline of the whole which he gave, were also printed by Mansi (t. vii. p. 777 sqq.); but without the notes which he placed below the text of each particular document of the *Codex encyclicus*, as he had done with the *versio Rustici*.

² *Judex* was the title of high state officials, even of those who had no precisely judicial functions = *magnates* and *proceres*. See Du Cange, *Glossar.* t. iii. p. 1570. Many such *Judices* are also mentioned in the Acts of the fifth Œcumenical Council.

former consul Anatolius, the prefect of the prætorians Palladius, the prefect of the city Tatian, the magister officiorum Vincomalus, the comes domesticorum Sparacius, and the comes privatorum Genethlius. Besides, as representing the Senate there were present the ex-consuls and patricians Florentius, Senator, Monnus (Nommus) and Protogenes, the former prefects Zoilus and Apollonius, the former prefect of the city Theodore, the former *prepositi sacri cubiculi*, Romanus and Artaxerxes, the former prefect of the prætorians Constantinus, and Eulogius, ex-prefect of Illyricum.¹ All these, the imperial commissioners, and the senators, had their places near the centre of the church, before the rails of the holy altar; next to them, on the left side, sat the representatives of Rome, the Bishops Paschasinus and Lucentius with the priest Boniface.² Bishop Julian of Cos also frequently appears as a fourth legate, but he had his seat not with the papal legates, but among the other bishops.

In what relation the legates stood to the Synod and to the imperial commissioners, may be ascertained with sufficient certainty from the detailed history of the Council. We shall see that the official arrangement of the business was managed by the commissioners. They took the votes, they consented to this or that being brought forward, and they closed the sessions; they thus discharged those functions which belong to the business management of an assembly. Still their management of the business had reference only to that which was external, so to speak, to the economy and business arrangements of the Synod: with that which was internal they did not interfere, but here left the decision to the Synod alone, and repeatedly distinguished quite expressly between themselves and it. At the head of the latter, the Synod in the proper and narrower sense, stood the papal legates.³ As, however, the direction of business was managed by the imperial commissioners, the papal legates appeared in the transactions rather as the first

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 563; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 53.

² The left was the place of honour. See Baron. *ad ann.* 213, 6, and 325, 58.

³ On the convocation and presidency of the Synod of Chalcedon, cf. my treatise in *Moy's Archiv für kath. K.-R.* Bd. ii. Heft 9, 10. Cf. also *History of Councils*, vol. i. p. 31 ff.

voters than as the presidents, but with an unmistakable superiority over all the other voters, as representatives of the head of the whole Church, as they expressly said, and firm in the conviction that every resolution of the Synod to which they did not assent was null and void. (Cf. session 16.) In the external form of the Synod, and also in the order of seating, they were only the first voters, but they were in fact the spiritual presidents. This view of ours is founded upon the words of the Synod itself to Pope Leo, which writes: *ὁν* (that is, of the bishops at Chalcedon) *σὺ μὲν, ὡς κεφαλὴ μελῶν, ἡγεμόνευες ἐν τοῖς τὴν σὴν τάξιν ἐπέχουσιν*, that is, "In thy representatives thou didst take the hegemony (presidency) over the members of the Synod, as the head over the members." By way of completion, the Synod adds still further: *βασιλεῖς δὲ πιστοὶ πρὸς εὐκοσμίαν ἐξῆρχον*, that is, "the believing Emperors presided for the sake of order, that all might proceed in good order."¹ In the same way the Synod recognized the superior position of the Pope by this, that they requested him to confirm their decrees;² and Leo said of his legates with the greatest decision: *Vice mea Orientali Synodo PRÆSEDERUNT*.³

Near and after the papal legates sat Bishops Anatolius of Constantinople, Maximus of Antioch, Thalassius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Stephen of Ephesus, and the other bishops of the East and of the provinces of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, with the exception of Palestine. On the other side, to the right, were Dioscurus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Quintillus of Heraclea in Macedonia Prima (representative of Bishop Anas-tasius of Thessalonica), Peter of Corinth, and the other bishops of the Egyptian province, of Illyricum, and of Palestine. In the midst of the great assembly were placed the holy Gospels.⁴

The catalogues of those present still existing are not quite complete.⁵ The Synod itself says, in a letter to Pope Leo, that

¹ In the collection of the letters of Leo, No. 98, in Baller. t. i. p. 1087; Mansi, t. vi. p. 147; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 655.

² Among the letters of Leo, Nos. 98, 100, 110, and 132, in Baller. l.c. pp. 1097, 1100, 1114, 1120, 1182, and 1263.

³ Ep. 103, in Baller. l.c. p. 1141; Mansi, t. vi. p. 185.

⁴ Mansi, t. vi. p. 579; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 66.

⁵ Mansi, t. vi. p. 565 sqq., and t. vii. p. 429 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 53 sqq. and 627 sqq.

520 bishops have been present.¹ Pope Leo, however, speaks of about 600 brethren (*Epist.* 102); and generally the number of all who were present, the representatives included, is reckoned at 630. In any case, none of the previous Synods had been nearly so numerous, and even among all that were subsequently held, but very few can in this respect be placed beside the Council of Chalcedon. Yet all these many bishops who were present, with the exception of the Roman legates and two Africans (Aurelius of Adrumetum and Rusticianus), were purely Greeks and Orientals, and even the two Africans seem not to have been properly representatives of their ecclesiastical provinces, but rather to have been present at the Synod as fugitives (expelled by the Vandals).²

SEC. 189. *First Session, October 8, 451.*

As already remarked, the first session took place on the 8th of October 451.³ The first to rise was the papal legate Paschasinus, with his colleagues, who stepped forward and said: "We have a commission from the most holy and most apostolic Bishop of Rome, who is the head of all the Churches, to see that Dioscurus shall have no seat (or vote) in the Council, and if he shall venture upon this, that he be expelled. This commission we must fulfil. If it seems well to your highnesses (the imperial commissioners), either he must retire or we depart." The secretary of the holy (that is, the imperial) consistory, Beronicianus, translated into Greek these words which had been spoken in Latin. To the question of the commissioners and senators as to what accusation *in specie* was brought against Dioscurus, Paschasinus gave at first no satisfactory answer; therefore the question was repeated, and now the second papal legate Lucentius explained that Dioscurus had assumed to himself a jurisdiction which did not

¹ Among the letters of Leo, No. 98, in Baller. t. i. pp. 1089 and 1100; Mansi, t. vi. p. 148; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 655. Only in the Greek text, not in all the Latin translations, of the synodal letter is the number 520 given.

² Tillemont, *Mémoires* etc., t. xv. p. 641.

³ Its Acts are found in Mansi, t. vi. pp. 563-938; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 54-274; abridged in German, Fuchs, *Bibliothek de Kirchenvers.* Bd. iv. S. 331 ff., and Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. vi. S. 334 ff.

belong to him, and had ventured to hold an (Œcumenical) Synod without the consent of the apostolic see, which had never been done before, and ought never to be done.¹ His colleague Paschasinus added that they, the legates, did not dare to depart from the commission of the apostolic bishop, from the ecclesiastical canons, and the traditions of the Fathers. The commissioners and the senators asked anew what was brought against Dioscurus, and when Lucentius remarked that "it would be an offence for them to see him whose case had to be inquired into sitting near them," they replied: "If you wish to sit as judge, you must not at the same time be accuser." Still they ordered Dioscurus to leave his place, and to sit in the middle (so that he was not absolutely to go out, but only to leave the ranks of those entitled to vote), by which means the papal legates were pacified.

Upon this Bishop Eusebius of Dorylæum came forward and declared that Dioscurus had ill-treated him and the faith, and had killed Bishop Flavian, and he requested that a petition should be read which he had addressed to the Emperors Marcian and Valentinian III. The commissioners and senators gave their consent, and Beronicianus now read the memorial, to the effect "that at the last Synod at Ephesus, which had better not have been held, Dioscurus had injured the true religion and confirmed the heresy of Eutyches by a mob of unruly people and by bribery. The Emperors should therefore command him to answer the accusations of Eusebius, and that the Acts of the Ephesine Synod (Robber-Synod) should again be read in the present Synod. From these he could bring proof that Dioscurus was opposed to the orthodox faith, that he had confirmed an impious heresy, and had unjustly condemned and ill-treated him the accuser."²

¹ Arendt (*Leod. Gr. u. s. Zeit.* S. 270) says: "Σύνοδον ἐπέλμψε παύσαι ἐπιτροπῆς διὰ τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ ἐρίνου meant only that he had, without the permission of the Pope, taken the presidency there and conducted the proceedings, for Leo himself had acknowledged the Synod by the fact that he allowed his legates to be present at it." A similar view was taken by the Ballerini in their edition of the works of Leo, t. ii. p. 460, note 15. Cf. vol. i. of this History, p. 7. [It should be remarked that there is no trustworthy evidence whatever that the Pope either joined in convoking the Synod of Nicaea, or was represented by the president.]

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 584 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 69.

Required to reply to this by the imperial commissioners and senators, Dioscurus first demanded that they should read the Acts of the Council at Constantinople under Flavian. When his opponents also presented this petition, he changed his plan and wished first to introduce a doctrinal discussion on the question, what was the true Christological faith; but the imperial commissioners and senators persisted in the reading of all the previous Acts, and at their command the imperial consistorial secretary, Constantine, read first the letter despatched to Dioscurus on the 30th March 449, by the deceased Emperor Theodosius II., respecting the summoning of the Robber-Synod.¹ When the secretary had further remarked that similar decrees had been despatched to other bishops, the commissioners and senators gave command that Bishop Theodoret of Cyrus should be introduced into the Synod, because Archbishop Leo (of Rome) had reinstated him in his bishopric, and the Emperor had commanded his presence.

The actual introduction of Theodoret caused a frightful storm. The party of Dioscurus, that is, the bishops of Egypt, Illyricum, and Palestine, cried out: "The faith is destroyed; the canons do not tolerate Theodoret; cast him out, this teacher (?) of Nestorius." The opposite party, the Orientals, those from Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, replied: "We were compelled by blows (at the Robber-Synod) to subscribe; we were forced to subscribe a blank paper; cast them out, the Manichæans, the enemies of Flavian, the opponents of the faith." Then Dioscurus cried again: "Theodoret anathematized the holy Cyril; shall Cyril now be cast out?" The other party immediately answered again: "Cast out the murderer Dioscurus: who is ignorant of his crimes?" The party of Dioscurus then drew in the name of the Empress Pulcheria, and cried out: "Prosperity to the Empress, she drove out Nestorius, therefore the orthodox Synod cannot receive Theodoret." Taking advantage of a momentary interruption, Theodoret himself stepped forward, and requested that his petition to the Emperors, which was at the same time a complaint against Dioscurus, should be read, upon which the commissioners and senators, in order to quiet men's minds, declared they would now proceed with the

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 586 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 70 sq.

particular, they had been threatened with deposition and exile, and soldiers with sticks and swords had surrounded them until they subscribed. They concluded their relation with the cry: "Out then with the murderer." (Dioscurus). The Egyptians replied: "They subscribed before us, why then do their clerics (whom they brought with them) now raise a cry? Clerics do not belong to the Synod, out with them!" Upon this Bishop Stephen of Ephesus, to show the character of the Robber-Synod, related the following incident. Because he had received some of Flavian's clergy and Eusebius of Dorylæum into communion, the imperial commissioners at that Synod, Elpidius and Eulogius, with about three hundred soldiers and monks of Eutyches, had come into his episcopal residence, and had threatened him with death, because he had received the enemies of the Emperor. But the adherents of Dioscurus had not allowed him to leave the Secretarium of the Church until he had subscribed.

After him Thalassius spoke: He had certainly been entered in the Emperor's letter as judge (and president of the Robber-Synod),¹ he knew not why; but when he saw that things which were unbecoming were taking place, he had earnestly endeavoured to prevent this, and he could bring witnesses to prove it.—Bishop Theodore of Claudiopolis in Isauria affirmed that he and others had understood little of the whole Synod, and had been imposed upon by Dioscurus and Juvenal. Besides, they had been alarmed by the exclamation: "They are neighbours of the Nestorian heresy," and, "He who rends Christ (into two natures) shall himself be rent. Rend them, kill them, cast them out!" Thus they had been alarmed for themselves and on account of those whom they had baptized, and therefore had been forced to hold their peace.

He added further, that the Emperor had commanded that the Synod should judge respecting Flavian, but Dioscurus and his friends had held many private meetings, and communicated their decisions to no one; but, on the contrary, a blank paper had been brought, and they had been surrounded by rough,

¹ The old Latin translation has here misunderstood the original, giving: in *secretario fueram positus*.

tumultuous mobs, and required to subscribe. Altogether one hundred and thirty-five bishops had been present, forty-two had been commanded to be silent, the rest had belonged to the party of Dioscurus and Juvenal, with the exception of him (Theodore) and fourteen others. "What," he said, "could we now have done? They played with our life and abused us as heretics," etc.

The Orientals and their friends testified to the truth of this statement; the Egyptians, on the other hand, remarked scornfully, "A true Christian does not allow himself to be frightened!" and Dioscurus said he thought "if they did not agree, they ought not to have signed, for it concerned the faith in which nothing should be surrendered." In order to weaken their statement with respect to the blank paper, he begged further to ask them: "How in that case their remonstrances could appear in the minutes?"¹

The imperial commissioners and the senators wished for the present to leave all special questions aside until the whole of the previous Acts should have been read, and at their command the secretary Constantine now began with the minutes of the Robber-Synod (compare above, p. 241 ff.). Immediately on the reading of the first words of these, it came out that Pope Leo—that is, his letters—had not been received at Ephesus, and that only the fifth place (see above, p. 241) had been again accorded to the bishop of Constantinople.² As a cry again arose at this, Dioscurus demanded anew that all who were not bishops should be required to leave, as the noise proceeded from them; but Theodore of Claudiopolis said he thought that it was the notaries of Dioscurus himself who so cried, upon which he gave assurance that he had only two notaries with him.³

Constantine then proceeded with the reading of the Acts of Ephesus up to the place where the papal legates stated that

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 601-606; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 79-83.

² The papal legate Paschasius expressed himself on this subject in such a manner that Quesnel concluded from it that he had recognized the precedence of the see of Constantinople over those of Alexandria and Antioch (in contradiction to other declarations of Rome). Compare on this subject our commentary on canon 23 of Chalcedon, below, § 200.

³ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 606, 607; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 83.

they had with them a letter of Leo's (see above, p. 242).¹ Upon this archdeacon Aetius of Constantinople remarked that Leo's letter had not been read at the Robber-Synod, and all the Oriental bishops and their friends agreed with him. He further maintained that Dioscurus had seven times promised on oath to have the letter read, but had not kept his oath, and Theodore of Claudiopolis confirmed this statement. On being interrogated by the commissioners, Dioscurus asserted that he had himself twice called out that this letter should be read; but Juvenal and Thalassius must have known why it was not done, and they ought to be asked. When the commissioners replied that he above all should defend himself, he merely repeated his former statement, upon which Eusebius of Dorylæum gave him the lie. Juvenal, on the other side, maintained that it took place in this manner, namely, that John, the primicerius of Dioscurus, instead of reading Leo's letter, had hastily taken in his hand a letter of the Emperor's (naturally by understanding with Dioscurus), and had read this with his (Juvenal's) permission (p. 243). When the commissioners asked Thalassius for an explanation, he contented himself with the statement that he had ordered neither the communicating nor the withholding of the papal letter, and, in fact, he had not been of sufficient importance to do so.²

The secretary Constantine then proceeded with the reading of the Ephesine minutes up to the place where they speak of the applause which Dioscurus had gained by his speech (see above, p. 244).³ The Orientals and their friends now denied that they had taken part in those acclamations, etc.; and Theodore of Claudiopolis asserted, besides, that at this point Dioscurus had driven away the notaries of the other bishops, and had everything taken down by his own notaries (who might easily have ascribed the acclamations of individual bishops to the whole Synod). Dioscurus could, indeed, prove that not he alone, but also Juvenal, Thalassius, and the bishop of Corinth had notaries (each of these one); but that he

¹ The documents read are found in Mansi, t. vi. pp. 607-615; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 83-87.

² Mansi, t. vi. pp. 615-618; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 87-90.

³ The Acts read are given in Mansi, l.c. pp. 618-623; Hardouin, l.c. pp. 90-94.

allowed no notary at all to those bishops who did not belong to his party, was proved by Bishop Stephen of Ephesus, who testified that their manuscripts had been taken away from his notaries, and their fingers had almost been broken at the same time (see above, p. 253). So Stephen of Ephesus and Acacius of Ariarathia pressed the point with reference to the enforced subscription of a blank paper, the latter adding: "We were kept shut up in the church until night-time, and even the sick were not allowed to refresh themselves or to go out, but soldiers, with sticks and swords, and monks were placed near us, and thus we were compelled to subscribe."¹ Cf. p. 253.

Again, without going into these points, the imperial commissioners ordered the further reading of the Acts in which mention was made of the introduction of Eutyches into the Robber-Synod, and of his confession (see above, p. 244). The first two remarks in reply, which were now made, were of no significance;² more important was it that Eusebius of Dorylæum declared the statement of Eutyches in the minutes to be untrue; that the third Œcumenical Council had directly forbidden every addition to the Nicene Creed. Dioscurus appealed to four manuscripts, but Diogenes of Cyzicus, on the other hand, remarked that Eutyches had not repeated the creed completely, for even at Constantinople (in the second Œcumenical Synod), on account of Apollinaris and Macedonius, there had been added: "He came down and was made man by the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin Mary," and that this was properly an explanation and not an addition. But the Egyptians and their friends cried: "Nothing from it, and nothing to it (the Nicene Creed), the Emperor will thus have it," and the like.³

A longer debate was occasioned by the reading of the subsequent words of Eutyches: "I anathematize Manes, etc., and those who say that the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ came down from heaven" (see above, p. 245). Eusebius of Dorylæum remarked that Eutyches had indeed (in his teaching) purposely avoided the expression "from heaven;" but he had not expressed himself on the point as to *whence* Christ

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 623-626; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 94.

² Mansi, l.c. pp. 626, 627; Hardouin, l.c. p. 95.

³ Mansi, l.c. p. 631; Hardouin, l.c. p. 98.

had taken His humanity. Diogenes of Cyzicus and Basil of Seleucia in Isauria likewise testified that Eutyches, although interrogated, had not expressed himself on this point and on the manner of the Incarnation before the Synod (of Constantinople).

Dioscurus here took the opportunity to assert his own orthodoxy, and to reproach Basil for having afterwards represented at Ephesus that the words which he addressed to Eutyches on this matter at the Synod of Constantinople had been incorrectly reported (p. 248 f.). Basil replied, amidst interruptions of approval and disapproval from the two parties, that his assertion was, and always had been, that he worshipped one Lord Jesus Christ, who was acknowledged in two natures even after the Incarnation, namely, in His perfect manhood and in His perfect Godhead. The one He had from the Father before all eternities, the other from His mother according to the flesh, and He had united this hypostatically (*καθ' ὑπόστασιν*) with Himself.

This explanation, which he had first given at the Synod at Constantinople, he had also read at Ephesus, and for that reason he had been rebuked by the Eutychians as a Nestorian. On the further expression of Eutyches (at Constantinople) that he acknowledged two natures before the Incarnation, but only one afterwards, he had replied to him: "If thou dost not acknowledge two undivided and unmingled natures even after the union, then thou dost assert a mingling and confusing." When these words also were read in Ephesus, a more violent tumult had arisen, and in the confusion and distress he had then said, half-unconsciously: "I do not remember to have employed this expression, but my words meant: if thou speakest absolutely only of one nature after the union, then thou teachest a mingling; but if thou speakest of one *σσεσαρκωμένη* and *ἐνανθρωπήσασα* *θύσις* in the sense of Cyril, then thou teachest the same as we" (cf. p. 248).

To the question of the commissioners, why, then, with his orthodox opinions, he had subscribed the judgment against Flavian, Basil answered, that he had been constrained to do so by the fear of the majority, who could have condemned him also. Dioscurus did not fail to reproach him with this weakness; and the answer of Basil, "that he had always shown

the courage of martyrdom before secular judges, but that one did not venture to resist the fathers (bishops)," shows that in fact he was unable to justify himself. And now the Oriental bishops who were friendly to him exclaimed more openly: "We have all failed (at Ephesus), we all ask for pardon." In this admission the commissioners thought they discovered a contradiction of the earlier statement of the Orientals and their friends, that they had subscribed a blank paper only by constraint; but certainly with injustice, for that very yielding to constraint was certainly a fault on the part of the bishops. They did not, however, allow themselves to be drawn into a discussion of this point, but renewed the cry: "We have all failed, we all ask for pardon,"¹ and Beronicianus again read a portion of the Ephesine Acts, containing the further declaration of Eutyches (see above, p. 245).²

Upon this Eusebius of Dorylaeum brought forward the complaint that he had not been allowed at Ephesus to proceed with his accusation against Eutyches; and Dioscurus, Juvenal, and Thalassius, when questioned by the commissioners on this point, could only excuse themselves by saying that it was not they, but the Emperor and his representative Elpidius, who had ordered this exclusion. The imperial commissioners replied that this excuse was not valid, for it had been a question of judging as to the faith, on which the Emperor's representative had not had to decide. But Dioscurus exclaimed: "How can you blame me for having violated the canons by yielding to the demand of Elpidius, since you violate them yourselves by the admission of Theodoret?" The commissioners replied: "Theodoret has entered as an accuser, and sits among the accusers, even as you (Dioscurus, etc.) among the accused."³ Constantine then again read a portion of the minutes of Ephesus, together with the Acts of the first session at Constantinople under Flavian, which were embodied in them (see above, pp. 189 and 246).⁴

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 634-639; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 99-102.

² The Acts read are given in Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 639-643; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 102-106.

³ Mansi, *l.c.* p. 643; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 106.

⁴ Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 646-655; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 106-114.

At the close of the reading of these minutes, the imperial commissioners and senators renewed the question, so disagreeable to Dioscurus, why at Ephesus Bishop Eusebius of Dorylæum had not been admitted, since he had been so fair in demanding a hearing for Eutyches at the Synod of Constantinople. Dioscurus persisted in silence, and the commissioners therefore allowed the reading to proceed. They now arrived at the minutes of the second session at Constantinople, embodied in the Acts of Ephesus, together with the documents belonging to it and the interruptions introduced at Ephesus (see pp. 190 and 246).¹ When the letter of Cyril to John of Antioch was read, a pause took place at Chalcedon, filled up with acclamations of various kinds.² Both parties simultaneously entered the conflict with shouts: "Honour to Cyril, we believe as he did." When the Orientals added: "Thus also Flavian believed, and was condemned for it: Eusebius of Dorylæum deposed Nestorius, but Dioscurus falsified the faith," the Egyptians replied: "God deposed Nestorius." In the same way, when the Orientals cried out, "Thus Leo believes, thus Anatolius," they added: "We all believe thus;" and all the bishops, together with the imperial commissioners and senators, shouted together: "Thus the Emperor believes, thus the Empress believes, thus we all believe."

There was still, however, another bitter pill for Dioscurus, for the Orientals and their friends again exclaimed: "Cast out the murderer of Flavian;" and the commissioners, in consequence of the Egyptians protesting their orthodoxy, put to them the question: "If you thus believe, why have you then received Eutyches, who teaches the opposite, into communion, and, on the other hand, have deposed Flavian and Eusebius?" Dioscurus knew of nothing better to do than to point to the Acts, and Beronicianus now read what Eustathius of Berytus had brought forward at Ephesus, in order to show that Cyril too acknowledged only one nature in Christ (see p. 246). The Orientals exclaimed: "That is Eutychian and Dioscurish."

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 658-674; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 114-126.

² Hardouin, t. ii. p. 126; Mansi, t. vi. p. 674, where, at the words: *Et cum legeretur epistola sanctæ memoriæ Cyrilli*, it should be noted that that which follows took place at Chalcedon.

But Dioscurus asserted that he too admitted no mingling of the natures. Upon this Eustathius endeavoured to show that his quotation from Cyril, which he had brought forward at Ephesus, was correct. This was true; but while he had at Ephesus attributed a Monophysite meaning to the words of Cyril, he now interpreted them in a sense quite orthodox, to this effect: "If any one speaks of only one nature in order thereby to deny that the humanity of Christ is of the same substance with us, and if any one speaks of two natures, in order thereby (like Nestorius) to divide the Son of God, let him be accursed." He added also, that he must say, in defence of Flavian, that he too had made use of the same words, and had thus expressed himself in his letter to the Emperor. This made the commissioners ask: "If this be so, why then did you agree to the condemnation of Flavian?" And to this Eustathius had no other answer than the confession: "I have been in fault."¹

Beronicianus then read how Flavian at the Synod at Constantinople had declared the true faith (on the two natures), and had required all the bishops who were present to put down their view in the minutes (see above, p. 191). Upon this the commissioners and senators asked if this confession of Flavian was orthodox, and they requested the members of the Synod to make a declaration on this point. The first who declared for the orthodoxy of Flavian was the Roman legate Paschasinus. To him followed Anatolius of Constantinople, the second legate Lucentius, Bishop Maximus of Antioch, Thalassius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Ancyra, and Eustathius of Berytus. Thereupon all the Orientals and their friends cried out together: "The martyr Flavian explained the faith correctly."² Dioscurus, however, demanded that the statement of Flavian should be read completely, and then he would answer the question which had been proposed. This demand was supported by Juvenal and his bishops from Palestine, but they at the same time acknowledged the orthodoxy of Flavian, and now left their places by the side of Dioscurus, so that they finally passed over to the other side amidst a shout of

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 674-678; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 126, 127.

² Mansi, l.c. p. 678 sq.; Hardouin, l.c. p. 127.

applause from the Orientals. The same was done by Peter of Corinth and Irenæus of Naupactus, who remarked that they had certainly not been members of the Ephesine Synod (as they were not bishops at that time), but what had been read had convinced them that Flavian had agreed with S. Cyril. They were followed by the other bishops of Hellas, and also by those of Macedonia and Crete, and by Nicolas of Stobi in Macedonia II., Athanasius of Busiris in the Egyptian Tripoli, Ausonius of Sebennytus, Nestorius of Phlagon, Macarius of Cabassi, Constantine of Demetrias in Thessaly, Eutychius of Adrianople, Cladaeus of Anchiasmus, Marcus of Euroia, Peregrinus of Phœnicia, and Soterichus of Corcyra. These passed over together to the other side. Dioscurus, on the contrary, declared: "Flavian was justly condemned, because he maintained that there were two natures after the union. I can prove from Athanasius, Gregory, and Cyril that after the union we should speak only of one incarnate nature of the Logos (*μία σεσαρκωμένη τοῦ Λόγου φύσις*). I am rejected with the fathers; but I defend the doctrine of the fathers, and give way in no point. Moreover, I must request, like many others, that the reading may go on."¹

This was done, and they came now to the particular votes which had been given at the Synod of Constantinople on the point of faith in question (see p. 191), together with the objections and exclamations brought forward on the other side at Ephesus (see p. 247).² Bishop Æthericus of Smyrna, who had denied at Ephesus the vote which he had given at Constantinople, and had professed to have spoken differently, now endeavoured to present his conduct at Ephesus in another light. For this he was compelled to hear bitter comments, not only from Dioscurus, but also from Thalassius, the latter of whom said: "You made your statement at Ephesus without any compulsion whatever, why do you now wish to withdraw it?"³ After Beronicianus had read some further votes, those of Bishops Valerian and Longinus, Dioscurus interposed with the remark: "I accept the expression, 'Christ is of two

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 679-683; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 130 sq.

² Mansi, l.c. p. 686 sq.; Hardouin, l.c. p. 131 sq.

³ Mansi, l.c. p. 690; Hardouin, l.c. p. 135.

natures' (ἐκ δύο), but not, 'there are two natures' (τὸ δύο οὐ δέχονται). I must stand forth boldly, for my life is in question." Eusebius of Dorylaeum retorted, that this was only a just recompense, for he had almost destroyed him, and Flavian actually.¹ Dioscurus replied, that he would defend himself before God. "Will you also before the laws?" asked Eusebius, adding that "it was necessary to defend himself also before these, for he had come forward here not as his encomiast, but as his accuser." The legate Paschasinus again made the remark that at Ephesus Dioscurus had not permitted Flavian to speak so much as he himself spoke here; but the imperial commissioners turned aside the reproach possibly implied in the words, with the remark that "the present Synod would be a just one;" and the second legate, Lucentius, agreed to this.²

Then Beronicianus read the close of the minutes of the second session at Constantinople, and only two slight interruptions occurred here, Dioscurus once exclaiming: "After the union there are no longer two natures;" whilst Eustathius of Berytus found fault with the expression: "He assumed man," saying that we ought instead to say: "He was made man and assumed our flesh."³

In perfect quiet, and without any interruption or objection, as at the Robber-Synod so also at Chalcedon, they proceeded with the reading of the minutes of the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth sessions of Constantinople.⁴ Immediately after these came those of the seventh session, together with the speeches occasioned by this reading at Ephesus (see above, pp. 199 ff. and 248). As we have already seen (p. 199), in the seventh session at Constantinople, Eusebius of Dorylaeum and Eutyches were opposed to each other as accuser and accused; and after a protracted discussion, Eusebius had put to Eutyches the decisive question: "Dost thou acknowledge the existence of two natures even after the Incarnation?" At this question the Robber-Synod, when the Acts of Constantinople were read, became

¹ The present Greek text says nothing here of Flavian.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 690 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 135.

³ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 691-698; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 135-139.

⁴ Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 698-730; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 139-158. Cf. above, pp. 191 and 248.

so enraged that they cried out: "Take and burn Eusebius;" and the whole Synod (according to the minutes) shouted: "Let him who confesses two natures be anathema" (p. 248). At Chalcedon the Oriental and other bishops who had been members of the Robber-Synod denied this emphatically, and even Dioscurus was forced to confess that only his Egyptians had thus exclaimed.¹

The minutes of Ephesus said further that the whole Synod had confirmed by acclamation the confession of faith of Eutyches, that "before the Incarnation our Lord was of two natures, but afterwards He had only one." Against this, too, the Orientals and their friends protested, and declared: "Only the Egyptians thus exclaimed: it is the doctrine of Dioscurus. Prosperity to the Emperor, many years to the Empress, many years to the Senate!" Bishop Eustathius of Berytus then offered the suggestion that the Synod should at the same time guard itself against the possible rejoinder, that it divided (like Nestorius) the natures in Christ; and Basil of Seleucia then declared (with the silent acquiescence of all): "We confess, but do not divide the two natures; we divide them not (like Nestorius), nor confuse them (like the Monophysites)."²

There now followed long readings without interruption. First came the close of the minutes of the seventh session of Constantinople (see above, p. 203 f.), and then the Acts of that synodal assembly which the Emperor Theodosius II. had appointed at the request of Eutyches for the verification of the minutes of the Synod of Constantinople (see p. 211 ff.). A second smaller commission of inquiry had, as we know, had to examine the statement of Eutyches, that the sentence of deposition pronounced against him had not been drawn up at the seventh session of the Council at Constantinople, but beforehand (see above, p. 219 f.), and the Acts of this assembly were again read at Chalcedon, as at Ephesus.³ Immediately after this came the explanation given by Basil of Seleucia at the Robber-Synod, in which he took back again the vote which,

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 739; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 163.

² Mansi, *l.c.* p. 743; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 166.

³ These Acts read are in Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 743-827; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 167-214.

in common with others, he had given at Constantinople: "That two natures were to be confessed."¹ Now at Chalcedon he asserted: "It is true that I presented a petition at Ephesus through the sainted Bishop John, that I might alter my statement made at Constantinople, but I did it from fear of thee, Dioscurus; for thou laidest great constraint upon us, as well by thy words as by the troops placed inside and outside the church. Soldiers with weapons were thrust into the church, and the monks of Barsumas stood round us, and the Parabolani,² and a multitude of people. Bishop Auxanius from Egypt, Athanasius, and all the others, if put upon their oath, must confess that I said to Dioscurus: 'Do not, sir, nullify the judgment of the whole world.'"

Then Dioscurus answered with the question: "Did I force you?" Basil answered: "Yes; by the threats of your troops you compelled us to such blood-guiltiness (towards Flavian). Consider yourselves how violent Dioscurus must then have been, when even now, when he no longer has more than six adherents, he insults us all." Dioscurus replied: "My notary Demetrian can certify that you asked him privately (and so not by compulsion) to alter your words." Basil replied: "I pray your highnesses (the commissioners and senators), ask all the metropolitans to declare upon the gospel whether, when we were sad and refused to vote, Dioscurus did not stand up and cry: Whoever does not subscribe has to do with me. Ask especially Eusebius (probably the bishop of Ancyra) on his oath, whether he was not almost condemned because he delayed his vote only a very short time." Dioscurus replied that Basil had not then for the first time, but at an earlier period, had his words altered; but without allowing this, Basil now requested that Dioscurus should bring forward everything which he knew against him, so that he might be able to answer for himself.³

In order to the further clearing up of the acts of violence

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 747, 827; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 167, 214. Cf. above, p. 246 and p. 306.

² ["An inferior order of church-officers who fulfilled the duty of hospital attendants and nurses to the sick poor, whom they relieved from the alms of the faithful."—*Dicty. of Chr. Antiq.*]

³ Mansi, t. vi. p. 827 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 214 sq.

at Ephesus, Bishops Onesiphorus of Iconium and Marinianus of Synnada related what we have mentioned above (p. 254), how they and other bishops had clasped the knees of Dioscurus and had entreated him on their knees not to ill-treat Flavian, and how he had threatened them, and had called in the counts with military and chains, and thus had compelled all to subscribe.¹ Then were read (a) the vote taken at the Robber-Synod on the orthodoxy of Eutyches and his restoration;² (b) the letter of the Eutychian monks to the Robber-Synod, and the approval of it given at Ephesus;³ and (c) those extracts from the Acts of the third Œcumenical Council which had also been repeated at the Robber-Synod.⁴

In the meantime night had come on, and the rest of the Acts of Ephesus, the voting on the condemnation of Flavian and of Eusebius of Dorykeum, had therefore to be read by candle light.⁵ After this had been done, the imperial commissioners and senators spoke and said: "The question respecting the right faith can be more carefully considered in the next session.⁶ As, however, it has now been shown by the reading of the Acts and by the avowal of many bishops who confess that they fell into error at Ephesus, that Flavian and others were unjustly deposed, it seems right that, if it so pleases the Emperor, the same punishment should be inflicted upon the heads of the previous Synod, Dioscurus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basil of Seleucia, and that their deposition from the episcopal dignity should be pronounced by the Council."

The Orientals and their friends exclaimed: "That is quite right." The Illyrians, on the contrary, cried out: "We have all erred, we all ask for pardon." Upon this the Orientals and others also demanded only the deposition of Dioscurus, and cried out: "Many years to the senate! holy God, holy

¹ Mansi and Hardouin, *ll.cc.*

² Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 831-862; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 215-234. Cf. above, p. 249.

³ Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 862-870; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 234-238. Cf. above, p. 250.

⁴ Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 871-902; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 238-254. Cf. above, p. 250 f.

⁵ Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 902-935; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 254-271. Cf. above, p. 251.

⁶ In this they went against the demand of the Pope, that there should be no more discussion on the faith. Cf. *Katholik*, 1872, Febr. S. 139.

Almighty, holy Immortal, have mercy upon us! Many years to the Emperors! The impious must ever be subdued! Dioscurus the murderer Christ has deposed! This is a righteous judgment, a righteous senate, a righteous Council!"

At the close, the commissioners demanded that each individual bishop should set forth his faith in writing (on the controverted point), without fear, having only God before his eyes. They should at the same time know that the Emperor would stand fast by the declarations of the 318 fathers at Nicæa and the 150 at Constantinople, as well as by the contents of the writings of the holy fathers Gregory, Basil, Athanasius, Hilary, Ambrose, and Cyril, which had been read and approved at the first Synod at Ephesus. Moreover, it was well known that Archbishop Leo of Rome had also written a letter against the Eutychian heresy to the sainted Flavian.—Many voices cried: "We have read it;" and then Aetius, Archdeacon of Constantinople, as first notary of the Synod, declared the first session ended.¹

SEC. 190. *Second Session, October 10, 451.*

At the second session,² which, like all those which followed, likewise took place in the church of S. Euphemia, there were already absent Dioscurus, Juvenal, and the four other bishops whose deposition had been pronounced by the imperial commissioners. They opened the new session with the request, that the Synod would now declare what the true faith was, so that the erring might be brought back to the right way. The bishops replied, protesting that no one could venture to draw up a new formulary (*ἐκθεσις*) of the faith, but that which had

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 935 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 271 sqq.

² The second and third sessions are in many manuscripts exchanged; that the ordinary numbering, however, which we follow, is the right one, was shown by Tillemont (t. xv. note 45, *Sur S. Léon*, p. 916), from the chronological dates connected with each session. The Ballerini, on the contrary, would maintain, supporting themselves upon Facundus (see p. 285, note), that these dates are also doubtful and of more recent origin; that our second session is in reality the third, and *vice versa*. Cf. Baller. ed. *Opp. S. Leonis*, t. ii. p. 502, nota. The Acts of the second session are in Mansi, t. vi. pp. 938-974; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 274-310. Abridged in German, Fuchs, *Bibliothek der Kirchenvers.* Bd. iv. S. 411 ff., and Walch, *Ketzehist.* Bd. vi. S. 341 ff.

been laid down by the fathers was to be held fast. This must not be departed from. Universal approval was accorded to the words of Bishop Cœcropsius of Sebastopol: "On the Eutychian question a test had already been given by the Roman archbishop, which they (that is, he and his nearest colleagues) had all signed," and all the bishops exclaimed: "That we also say, the explanation already given by Leo suffices; another declaration of faith must not be put forth."

The imperial commissioners and senators, however, were not contented with this, but, holding to their previous demand, they proposed that all the patriarchs (οἱ ὀσιώτατοι πατριάρχαι διοικήσεως ἐκάστης) should come together, along with one or two bishops of their province,¹ and take common counsel respecting the faith, and communicate the result, so that, by its universal acceptance, every doubt in regard to the faith might be removed, or in case that, contrary to their expectations, those believing otherwise should be present, these would immediately be made manifest.—Again the bishops replied: "A written declaration of faith we do not bring forward. This is contrary to the rule" (the prescription of the third Œcumenical Council, *Actio* vi., see above, p. 70f.). Bishop Florentius of Sardes added by way of mediating: "As those who have been taught to follow the Nicene Synod, and also the regularly and piously assembled Synod at Ephesus, in accordance with the faith of the holy fathers Cyril and Cœlestine (the Pope), and also with the letter of the most holy Leo, cannot possibly draw up at once a formula of the faith, we therefore ask for a longer delay; but I, for my part, believe that the letter of Leo is sufficient."

At the suggestion of Cœcropsius, the older documents, in which the true faith had already been set forth, were publicly read, and (a) before all the Nicene Creed with the anathema against the Arian heresy. The bishops then exclaimed: "That is the orthodox faith, that we all believe, into that we were baptized, into that we also baptize; thus Cyril taught, thus believes Pope (ὁ Πάπας) Leo."² (b) With similar accla-

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 953; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 285. Here the superior metropolitans of the great districts (= civil dioceses) are already named patriarchs, cf. vol. i. p. 391.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 955; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 286 sq.

mations the Creed of Constantinople was received. (c) To this succeeded the reading of that letter from S. Cyril to Nestorius, which had been approved at Ephesus (see above, pp. 20 f. and 47), and of his subsequent letter (the pacificatory document) to Bishop John of Antioch (see above, p. 137), both of which documents, besides, had already been read in the first session of our Council, among the Acts of Constantinople (see above, p. 307). After further acclamations (d) it came to the turn of the celebrated letter of Leo to Flavian, the contents of which we have already communicated (see above, p. 225 ff.), and which was now read in a Greek translation, and without the patristic proofs which had been appended to it (although not at the beginning) by Leo himself.¹ After this was done, the bishops exclaimed: "That is the faith of the fathers, that is the faith of the apostles! We all believe thus, the orthodox believe thus! Anathema to him who believes otherwise! Peter has spoken by Leo: thus Cyril taught! That is the true faith! Why was that not read at Ephesus (at the Robber-Synod)? Dioscurus kept it hidden."²

Three passages in the letter of Leo had, however, raised doubts among the bishops of Illyricum and Palestine. In what these doubts consisted, we learn for the first time from the acts of the fourth session. The wording of these passages appeared to imply a certain kind of division of the divine and human in Christ, and thus not to keep sufficiently clear of Nestorianism. These passages are (a) in chap. iii.: "In order to pay our debt, the invisible nature united itself with the passible, so that, as our salvation required, the one Mediator between God and man on the one side could die, on the other could not." In order to pacify them, Archdeacon Aetius of Constantinople read a passage from the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius, in which it was similarly said, "because the *σάρξ* (manhood) of the Lord died for us, therefore it is said: *He* died, not as though *He* could taste death in *His* proper divine

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 962 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 299 sqq., have even given these patristic passages, but note that they are wanting in most manuscripts. That they were not read in our second session, is shown by the Ballerini, *l.c.* t. i. p. 798, n. 8.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 971; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 306.

nature, but because His *σάρξ* tasted death."¹ (β) The same bishops then took exception, in the second place, to the passage in chap. iv.: "Each of the two forms (natures) does in communion with the other that which is proper to it, since the word (of God) performs that which belongs to the word, and the flesh accomplishes that which belongs to the flesh. The one flashes forth gloriously in miracles, the other submits to insults." As parallels to this, Actius again read an expression of S. Cyril from the synodal letter to Nestorius, which was connected with the twelve anathematisms, as follows: "Some expressions in the Holy Scriptures apply best to God, others to the manhood, and others again hold a middle position, showing that the Son of God is both God and man."² (γ) Finally, they were struck with another passage in the same chap. iv.: "Although in Christ there is only one person of God and of man, yet the glory and the shame which are common to the two natures have a different source. From us He has the manhood, which is inferior to the Father; from the Father He has the Godhead, which is equal to the Father." Thereupon Theodoret remarked, that S. Cyril also had similarly expressed himself, and quoted the passage: "He became man, and changed not His properties, but remained what He was. The one, however, is comprehended as thoroughly dwelling in the other, that is, the divine nature in the manhood."³

The imperial commissioners and the senate now put the question: "Has any one still any doubt?" They replied with acclamation: "No one doubts." Notwithstanding, the bishops of Illyricum were not quite satisfied, for one of them, Atticus of Nicopolis (in Epirus), requested that they would allow a few days' delay, during which the members of the Synod might quietly consider and settle the question. And as the letter of Leo had been read, they should also have a copy of that

¹ Mansi, *l.c.* p. 663, t. vii. p. 971; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1275, t. ii. pp. 118 and 307; cf. above, p. 21.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 971 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 307. This is the substance of a longer exposition in Cyril, *l.c.*; Hardouin, t. i. p. 1290; Mansi, t. iv. p. 1078; see above, p. 30 f. Exactly the same words were used by Cyril in a letter to Acacius of Melitene. See Mansi, t. v. p. 322; see above, p. 144.

³ Cyril says the same in the synodal letter quoted above. See Hardouin, t. i. p. 1286; Mansi, t. iv. p. 1071 sqq.

letter of Cyril to Nestorius, to which the twelve anathematisms were appended, so that they might be able to prepare for the proceedings on the subject. The other bishops exclaimed: "If we are to have delay, we must request that all the bishops in common shall take part in the desired consultation;" and the imperial commissioners and the senators, agreeing to this, declared: "The assembly is put off for five days, and the bishops shall, during that time, meet with Anatolius of Constantinople, and take counsel together concerning the faith, so that the doubting may be instructed." They were interrupted by the cry: "None of us doubts, we (but certainly not all) have already subscribed," and then they went on: "It is, however, not necessary that all come together, but Anatolius may choose out of those who have already subscribed Leo's letter such as he thinks fitted to instruct the doubting." (Cf. below, § 192, p. 330 f.)

When the session was about to terminate, some bishops, probably of those from Illyricum, took advantage of this moment in order to intercede for the heads of the Robber-Synod. They cried: "We petition for the fathers, that they may be allowed again to enter the Synod. The Emperor and the Empress should hear of this petition. We have all erred; let all be forgiven!" Thereupon a great commotion arose, a contest of shouts and counter-shouts between the two parties. The clergy of Constantinople exclaimed: "Only a few cry for this, the Synod itself says not a syllable." Thereupon the Orientals and others cried out: "Exile to the Egyptian;" and the Illyrians: "We beseech you pardon all!" The Orientals: "Exile to the Egyptian;" the Illyrians: "We have all erred; have mercy on us all. These words to the orthodox Emperor: 'The Churches are rent in pieces'" (that is, schisms are arising through that deposition). And again the clergy of Constantinople exclaimed: "To exile with Dioscurus; God has rejected him," and, "whoever has communion with him is a Jew." The Illyrians and Orientals continued their exclamations, until at last the commissioners put an end to the subject with the words: "The consultation with Anatolius, which we have already required, must now be taken in hand."¹

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 974 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 307 sqq.

SEC. 191. *Third Session, October 13, 451.*

Before the expiry of the appointed interval of five days, the third general session was held on the 13th of October in the same church.¹ It is nowhere intimated that the imperial commissioners and the senators were present, and on this occasion their names are found neither in the catalogue of those present which is prefixed to the Acts, nor in the text among those who speak. They said subsequently that the condemnation of Dioscurus (at this session) had taken place without their knowledge; and from this we might perhaps conclude that the holding of this third session had not been announced to them. But this is not the case; it appears, on the contrary, more probable that they purposely remained away from this session, in order to avoid the appearance of the imperial authority having brought about the condemnation of Dioscurus and deprived the bishops of their full liberty.² The number of the bishops who were present at this session was also smaller, as those who were friendly to Dioscurus did not appear. The list, which is, however, imperfect, has the names of only two hundred as being present.

This new session was opened by Archdeacon Aetius of Constantinople, as first notary of the Synod, with the intelligence that Eusebius of Dorylaeum, besides the complaint against Dioscurus, which he had read at the first session, had given in a second which he was ready to communicate. The papal legate, Paschasinus, remarked that, as Leo had given him com-

¹ The Acts of this session are in Mansi, t. vi. pp. 975-1102; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 310-382. Arendt thinks (*Papst Leo u. s. Zeit*, S. 279) that this session took place in a chapel of the church of S. Euphemia, because the Acts say, *ἐν τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τῆς ἁγίας . . . Ἐφρημίας*. . . . But it is the church itself of the Holy Martyr which is thus designated.

² Arendt says (S. 279): "The absence of the senate seems astonishing; but it is not so in fact, for the chief work of the session was, as is clear from the contents of the Acts, the definite pronouncing of the judgment on Dioscurus. The reasons involved were half ecclesiastical, half political. In regard to the political element, the senate had already given their judgment; in regard to the other, the ecclesiastical, which lay entirely outside their sphere, the senate had no need to be present, and their absence only shows how fully the State recognized the necessity that the purely ecclesiastical proceedings should be free and independent, and as little as possible influenced, but left to the spirituality."

mission to preside in his place, therefore all that was brought forward at the Synod must go through him, and that he now ordered the reading of this accusation. The principal contents were: "I have brought against Dioscurus the accusation that he holds the same opinions with Eutyches, the condemned and anathematized heretic; but at the recently held Synod at Ephesus he obtained power by the violence of his troops and by money, he violated the true faith, he introduced a heretical leaven into the Church, and robbed me of my spiritual office. As it has already been shown in the previous transactions (first session) that Dioscurus taught heretically, that he excluded me from the Synod at Ephesus (the Robber-Synod), and prevented both me and Bishop Flavian from defending our just allegations; as it has further been shown that he had the minutes entered differently from what was spoken, and enforced the subscription of a blank paper: I therefore pray that you will have pity upon me and decree that all which was done against me be declared null, and do me no harm, but that I be again restored to my spiritual dignity. At the same time anathematize his evil doctrine and punish him for his insolence according to his deserts."¹

Eusebius added orally the petition that he might be personally confronted with his opponent. Actius stated that the session had been announced to Dioscurus, as to all the other bishops, by two deacons, and he had answered them that "he would willingly appear, but his guards prevented him." Paschasius immediately sent out first two priests, Epiphanius and Elpidius, from the church, to see whether Dioscurus was in the neighbourhood; and as this had no result, at the suggestion of Anatolius of Constantinople, three bishops, Constantine, Metropolitan of Bostra, Acacius of Ariarath, and Atticus of Zele, together with the notary Himerius, were sent to Dioscurus at his lodging, to require his appearance. Dioscurus answered them also that he would willingly come, but that he was prevented by his guards, the Magistriani and Scholarii (imperial officers).—The synodal deputies were on their way back with this answer when Eleusinius, the assistant of the *Magister sacrorum officiorum*, met them, and as he

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 986; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 311.

asserted that Dioscurus might appear at the Synod if he wished,¹ they returned to him and renewed their demand. Deprived now of his previous excuse, Dioscurus replied that "it had been decided respecting him in the previous (first) session by the imperial commissioners, and now they wished to annul this. He demanded that his affair should again be brought forward in the presence of the commissioners and senators." The deputies did not fail to represent to Dioscurus, that, consequently, that was not true which he had at first said to them, and then reported to the Synod the result of their mission.²

Then three bishops, Pergamius of Antioch in Pisidia, Cecropius of Sebastopolis, and Rufinus of Samosata, together with the notary Hypatius, were sent with a written invitation to Dioscurus, to the effect, "that it was not in order to annul anything which had been decreed in the first session, but to examine new matters of complaint which Eusebius of Dorylæum had brought forward, that the Synod had invited Dioscurus, and he was bound to appear, in accordance with the canonical rules." Dioscurus now declared that he was ill; and when the deputies met him, he said he had just recovered, but he returned to his former excuse that he would now appear if the imperial commissioners were present, and added, that then the other heads of the Synod of Ephesus—Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius, Basil, and Eustathius (see above, pp. 224, 301, 314)—would also be forced to appear with him. The deputies replied that the new complaint of the Bishop of Dorylæum was directed against Dioscurus alone, and not also against the five others, and that therefore their presence was not necessary; but Dioscurus adhered to his refusal.³

When the synodal deputies had again returned and given information respecting their mission, Eusebius of Dorylæum proposed to send a third invitation to Dioscurus. Before this was prepared, some clerics and laymen who had come from Alexandria were allowed to appear before the Synod, in order

¹ This incident is brought forward by the synodal deputies somewhat later. Mansi, t. vi. p. 995; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 315 D.

² Mansi, t. vi. pp. 987-995; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 314 sqq.

³ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 995-1003; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 315-319.

to present complaints against Dioscurus. The papal legate Paschasinus asked these new complainants whether they were ready to prove their accusations against Dioscurus, and when they said they were, their complaints were read. They were four in number, and were all addressed to "the Archbishop and Patriarch of great Rome, Leo, and to the holy and Œcumenical Synod," and the first of them, from the Alexandrian deacon Theodore, said that "he (Theodore) had served for two and twenty years among the Magistriani (imperial bodyguard), that then the holy Cyril of Alexandria had taken him into his service about the time of the Synod of Ephesus, and had advanced him to be a cleric. For fifteen years he had been in this position, and then Dioscurus, after entering upon his office (A.D. 444), without any written or oral complaint having been brought against him, had deposed him from his spiritual office, and threatened him with expulsion from the city, and this for no other reason than that he had enjoyed the confidence of Cyril. He had persecuted in a similar manner all the relations and servants of Cyril. In Cyril, however, this heretic, this Origenist hated the true faith. He had thrown out insults against the holy Trinity, and had taken part in murder, in cutting down the trees of others, in burning and in destroying houses. Further, he had always lived in a disgraceful manner, as he was ready to prove. He had done even worse than the things which he had practised against Flavian. He had ventured to pronounce a sentence of excommunication against the apostolic see of Rome, and by threats had compelled the ten bishops who had come from Egypt with him, for several refused to accompany him, to subscribe this excommunication. They had subscribed weeping and lamenting. In order that the proof of all this might be possible, the Synod should have the following persons brought under guard: Agorast, Dorotheus, Eusebius, and the notary John.¹ He himself would bring forward upright witnesses at the proper time."²

The second complaint was presented by the deacon Ischyriou.

¹ That these were friends and assistants of Dioscurus, is clear from the close of the complaint of Ischyriou. See below, p. 325. Walch, *l.c.* S. 350, has erroneously confounded them with the witnesses whom Theodore was ready to bring forward.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 1006 sqq. ; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 322 sqq.

He declared how violently Dioscurus had behaved, how he had destroyed the goods, trees, and dwellings of his opponents, had driven some away, had punished others, and had also been disrespectful towards the holy relics. All this was known in Alexandria by the people, the clergy, and the monks. When the Emperors had granted corn to the poor churches of Libya, in order that they might make from it bread for the Eucharist and feed the poor, he had forbidden the bishops of those regions to receive it, and had bought it himself and stored it up, in order to sell it again, in a time of dearth, at huge prices. In the same way, he had not permitted the institutions to be completed, which the pious matron Peristeria had set up for convents, hospitals, and the like, but had squandered the money given for the purpose on persons connected with theatres. His dissolute life was generally known, and women of evil reputation went out and in to the dwelling of the bishop, and his bath, particularly the celebrated Pansophia, surnamed *'Οπεινή* (that is, *Montana*, *Montez*!), so that a popular song had even been circulated about her and her lover (Dioscurus), as would be shown. Moreover, Dioscurus had also murders on his conscience. Ischyriion further speaks of himself, how Cyril had shown him confidence, and how many troublesome journeys and pieces of business he had accomplished as his agent, so that, as they could see, his health had been weakened by them. But Dioscurus had immediately expelled him from the holy service, and had allowed his property to be burned, and his trees to be cut down by monks and others, so that he was now a beggar. Nay, he had even given it in charge to the presbyter Mennas, and the deacons Peter and Harpocraton, with other officers, to put him to death, and it was only by timely flight that he had then saved his life. Subsequently he had actually been laid hold of by this Harpocraton, the most cruel of the assistants of Dioscurus,¹ and imprisoned in a hospital without any charge having

¹ The complaint adds, "The cruelty of Harpocraton had been seen at the Robber-Synod in his ill-treatment of Flavian and of Proterius, then a priest, now a bishop." As Proterius did not become Bishop of Alexandria until after the deposition of Dioscurus, the words, "now a bishop," must be a later addition. Cf. Walch, *l.c.* S. 352.

been brought against him. And even in this prison Dioscurus had made attempts upon his life, and finally had set him at liberty only upon grievous conditions, for example, that he should leave his native city Alexandria. He requested that the Synod would have pity upon him, and admit him to prove his accusations, and after examination, restore him again to his spiritual office. In conclusion, he prayed that they would have Agorast, Dorotheus, Eusebius, Didion, Harpocraton, Peter, and the bishop's bathmaster, Gaianus, apprehended, so that they might be heard. At the proper time he would then bring forward upright witnesses.¹

The third complaint was preferred by the Alexandrian presbyter Athanasius. Immediately at the beginning he says: "He and his departed brother Paul were sons of Isidora, a sister of Cyril. In his testament, Cyril had left great legacies to his successor, and had at the same time adjured him to be friendly to his relatives. Dioscurus, however, hating Cyril on account of his orthodoxy, had done the contrary, and had persecuted his relatives. He had immediately threatened him and his brother Paul with death and had driven them from Alexandria, so that they had gone to Constantinople to seek for protection. At the instigation of Dioscurus and his friends Chrysaphius and Nonnus, they had, however, been arrested in Constantinople, and had been so long ill-treated that they were at last reduced to purchase their liberty by the sacrifice not only of all their moveable property, but also by additional sums, which they had to borrow from usurers. In consequence of this, his brother Paul had died, but he himself (Athanasius) and his aunts, and the wife and children of his brother, had fallen into debt to such an extent, that, on account of the demands of the usurers, they had no longer ventured to go out. The very houses of the family (in Alexandria) had been seized by Dioscurus and turned into churches, and even his (the complainant's) own had been taken, although, as being removed four houses from the others, it could not be used for that purpose. Moreover, without any charge having been brought against him, he had deprived him of his priestly office, and had struck him off the church register. For seven years he had

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 1011-1019; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 326 sqq.

wandered about, fleeing sometimes from Dioscurus, sometimes from his creditors. Not once in convents or churches had Dioscurus allowed him to find rest, and he had forbidden that he should have a loaf or a bath, so that he had almost died of hunger and misery. The sum which he had been compelled to give to Nomus amounted to about 1400 pounds of gold; and as he had also been robbed of his other property, he was forced, with the two or three slaves who still remained to him, to support himself by begging. Moreover, Dioscurus had also extracted great sums of money from Cyril's other relatives. He (the complainant) prayed therefore for assistance, and for the restitution of that which Nomus had taken from him, so that he might be able to repay his creditors. He was ready to prove everything."¹

The fourth complainant from Alexandria was a layman named Sophronius. He had also been plunged into poverty by Dioscurus. The occasion was quite peculiar. Macarius, an official of Alexandria, had robbed Sophronius of his wife Theodota, and this, although no separation or quarrel had taken place between the husband and wife. On this account he had made his complaint before the Emperor and the chief ministers, and the chief judge Theodore had been sent from Constantinople to examine the matter. Dioscurus had declared that this whole trial belonged to him and not to the Emperor, and sent the deacon Isidore to him with officers to require the departure of the judge Theodore. Not contented with that, this deacon, at the command of Dioscurus, had taken everything away from Sophronius, who had fled. He now asked for assistance, and was ready to prove that Dioscurus had insulted the holy Trinity, had been guilty of adultery, and even of treason; and when the Emperor Marcian was at Alexandria, he had, by Agorast and Timothy, distributed money among the people, to induce them to drive the Emperor away. This could be proved by the tribune and notary John, and if Theodore had not then been administering the province of Egypt, the city of Alexandria would have been plunged into great misfortune through the fault of Dioscurus. Finally, Sophronius affirmed that many others had to complain of

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 1022 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 331 sqq.

Dioscurus, but were too poor to appear personally, and he asked that Agorast might be arrested.¹

The Synod resolved to embody all these complaints in the minutes, and then caused Dioscurus to be invited a third time by Bishops Francion of Philippopolis in Thrace, Lucian of Byzia in Thrace, and John of Germanicia in Syria. The deacon Palladius accompanied them as notary. They were entrusted with a letter to Dioscurus, in which his previous excuses were represented as false, and he was required to defend himself against the accusations brought forward by Eusebius of Dorylaeum, and by the clerics and laymen from Alexandria. If he still refused to appear after this third invitation, he would be subject to the punishments which were pronounced by the canons against the despisers of the Synods.²

This third citation also remained without result, for Dioscurus simply declared that "he adhered to that which he had previously said, and he could add nothing more," and all the efforts of the deputies to induce him to yield, and to touch his conscience, were in vain.—After they had again informed the Synod of this, the papal legate Paschasius put the question, what was now to be done, and whether they should proceed with the canonical punishments against Dioscurus. After several bishops had given their views, and had specially asked the legates to pronounce judgment, these summed up the accusations which had been presented against Dioscurus: "It had been shown," they said, "by to-day's and the previous (first) session, what Dioscurus had dared to do against holy order and Church discipline. To pass over much else, he had received back into communion Eutyches, as being of the same opinions as himself, although he had been justly deposed by his Bishop Flavian, and this he had done in an irregular manner, before he united with the other bishops at the Ephesine Synod. These other bishops and members of the (Robber) Synod had received forgiveness from the apostolic see for that which they did there against their will, and they had also shown themselves obedient to the holy Archbishop Leo and to the most holy Œcumenical Synod. Dioscurus, on

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 1030 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 335 sqq.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 1035 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 339.

the contrary, had, up to the present moment, proudly persisted in that for which he ought to have lamented earlier. Moreover, he had not allowed the letter of Leo to Flavian to be read at Ephesus, although he had often been requested, and although he had promised upon oath to do so. Instead of repenting afterwards, like the other bishops, he had even ventured to pronounce a sentence of excommunication against the holy Archbishop Leo. Several complaints against him had been presented to the holy Synod, and as he had not appeared after an invitation had been sent to him three times, he had thereby practically pronounced judgment upon himself." To this the legates added their sentence in the following form: "Therefore the most holy Archbishop of Rome, Leo, has, by us and the present most holy Synod, in communion with the most blessed Apostle Peter, who is the rock and support of the Catholic Church and the foundation-stone of the orthodox faith, declared this Dioscurus to be deprived of his bishopric, and that he shall lose all spiritual dignity. In accordance herewith, this most holy and great Synod will decide respecting the aforesaid Dioscurus, what appears to be agreeable to the canons."¹

All those present, the Patriarchs Anatolius of Constantinople and Maximus of Antioch at their head, assented to this judgment,² and subscribed the deposition of Dioscurus.³

The document, which was directly afterwards handed to Dioscurus, is as follows: "The holy and great and Œcumenical Synod . . . to Dioscurus. Learn that, on account of despising the divine canons, on account of thy disobedience to the Synod, since, besides thine other offences, thou didst not respond to

¹ Mansi, t. vi. pp. 1038-1047; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 339-346.

² Their votes are given in Mansi, t. vi. pp. 1047-1080; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 346-365. The old Latin translation has preserved 186 votes, with reasons assigned. The reasons given vary; but least frequently is disobedience to the Synod given as a reason for his condemnation.

³ The subscriptions are given in Mansi, t. vi. pp. 1080-1094; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 365-376. The list here given has 294 subscriptions of bishops (or their representatives), among them those of Juvenal, Thalassius, Eustathius of Berytus, and Eusebius of Ancyra (not, however, of Basil of Seleucia). As, however, the four former associates of Dioscurus just named were not present at the third session (see above, p. 322), it appears that they and the other forty-nine bishops (and priests) whose names stand after theirs, did not subscribe until afterwards.

their threefold invitation, thou wast, on the 13th of October, deposed by the holy Œcumenical Synod from the episcopal office, and deprived of all spiritual functions."¹

The clergy of Dioscurus, who were present at Chalcedon, particularly his steward Charmsynus and his archdeacon Euthalius, were made acquainted with this judgment, and with the requirement of the Synod that all the property of the Church of Alexandria which they had in their hands should be carefully preserved, as they would be required to give an account of it to the future Bishop of Alexandria.—In a subsequent document, an official placard, which was destined for the cities of Chalcedon and Constantinople, the Synod contradicted the report that Dioscurus would be again reinstated in his office; to the Emperors Valentinian III. and Marcian, however, they sent a copy of the minutes with a letter, in which the reasons for the deposition of Dioscurus (that he had suppressed the letter of Leo, had received Eutyches into communion, had ill-treated Eusebius of Dorylæum, had excommunicated the Pope, and had not obeyed the Synod) were briefly given, and the hope expressed that the Emperors would approve of what had been done.—The synodal letter to Pulcheria is composed in a more flowing style, and in it her great merit in obtaining the triumph of orthodoxy is commended, and intelligence given of the deposition of Dioscurus. The bishops in this assume that the Empress will also give her approval, and close with the assurance that one who is so zealous for the cause of God as Pulcheria cannot miss the divine reward.²

SEC. 192. *Fourth Session, October 17, 451.*

At the fourth session, on the 17th of October 451, the imperial commissioners and the senate were again present,³

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 1094; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 378.

² Mansi, t. vi. pp. 1095–1102; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 378 sqq. The two latter documents, the two letters to the Emperors and to Pulcheria, are now extant only in Latin. It is remarkable that, in the letter to Pulcheria, only a single reason is specially assigned for the deposition of Dioscurus, his withholding of the papal letter.

³ The Acts of this session are given in Mansi, t. vii. pp. 1–97; Hardouin, t. ii.

and first of all had those passages read from the minutes of the first session, in which they had pronounced for the deposition of Dioscurus, Juvenal, Thalassius, Eustathius, Eusebius of Ancyra, and Basil, and had required written confessions of faith from the bishops. There was then read from the Acts of the second session the decree that a delay of five days should be allowed for the discussion of the dogma, and following upon this, the commissioners and senators put the question, "What had the reverend Synod now decreed concerning the faith?"¹ In his own name and in that of his colleagues, the papal legate Paschasinus replied to this: "The holy Synod holds fast the rule of faith which was ratified by the fathers at Nicæa and by those at Constantinople. Moreover, in the second place, it acknowledges that exposition of this creed which was given by Cyril at Ephesus. In the third place, the letter of the most holy man Leo, Archbishop of all Churches, who condemned the heresy of Nestorius and Eutyches, shows quite clearly what is the true faith, and this faith the Synod also holds, and allows nothing to be added to it or taken from it."²

After the secretary Beronicianus had translated this declaration into Greek, all the bishops exclaimed: "We also all believe thus, into that we were baptized, into that we baptize, thus we believe" (cf. p. 316). The commissioners and the senate required that all the bishops should swear by the Gospels placed in the midst of them whether the declarations of faith of Nicæa and Constantinople agreed with Leo's letter or not. First Anatolius of Constantinople affirmed it, adding that Leo's letter also harmonized with the declarations and decrees of the first Synod at Ephesus. The three papal legates

pp. 382-446. An abridgment in German by Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 437 ff.; Walch, *l.c.* S. 360 ff. The list of those present, which is placed at the head of the Acts, is very defective.

¹ As we saw (p. 319), a commission of bishops were within the five days to confer with Anatolius concerning the faith. That they held meetings for this purpose is expressly said by the bishops of Illyricum (331); besides, it may be concluded from the subsequent expressions of Paschasinus that they had had a conference, and had thus taken the very resolution which Paschasinus now announces to the commissioners, and which is in conformity with the results of the second session. We shall meet with a later and important transaction of this commission in the introduction to the fifth Œcumenical Synod.

² Mansi, t. vii. p. 7 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 386.

affirmed the same, and after them came all the other voters in turn, sometimes in shorter, sometimes in fuller declarations.¹

With very few exceptions, all likewise remarked that they had already subscribed Leo's letter.² What is most important for us is the manner in which the bishops of Illyricum and Palestine comported themselves, who, as we know, had raised some objections to Leo's letter at the second session. The bishops of Illyricum, through Bishop Sozon of Philippi, now had the written declaration read: "That they were inviolably devoted to the faith of the fathers of Nicaea and Constantinople, and to the decrees of the first Synod at Ephesus, and that they were also fully convinced of the orthodoxy of the most holy father and Archbishop Leo. But that which in his letter appeared to them not quite clear, and liable to be misunderstood, the papal legates had explained quite satisfactorily when they were all assembled with Anatolius, and had anathematized every one who separated the manhood of our Lord from His Godhead, and did not confess that the divine and the human attributes existed in Him *unmingled* and *unchanged* and *undivided* (ἀσυγχύτως καὶ ἀτρέπτως καὶ ἀδιαίρετως). On this they had in a body signed Leo's letter and had agreed with him."³

An expression to the same effect was read by Bishop Anianus (Ananias) of Capitolias, in Palestina II., instructed by the bishops of Palestine: "We all hold fast by the faith of the 318 fathers of Nicaea and of the 150 of Constantinople, and agree with the decrees of the first Synod of Ephesus. When the letter of Leo was read to us, we gave our assent to the greatest part of its contents. But some parts of it seemed to us to express a certain separation of the divine

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 10 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 386 sqq.

² This had taken place at the assembly and council which they held with Anatolius, as the bishops of Illyricum explain in what follows.

³ Mansi, t. vii. p. 27 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 399 sqq. Fuchs (l.c. S. 438) maintains that only two bishops, one from Illyricum and one from Palestine, had given special declarations. This error of his was caused by the incorrect printing in the editions. The votes of Euphratas and Marcianus, the former of whom finally voted among those of Illyricum, the latter among those of Palestine, should evidently be separated from the collective declarations which followed by a point and an interval. But that on the one side the whole of the Illyricans, on the other the whole of those of Palestine, gave the statement in question is clear from the use of the plural at the beginning and from the whole context.

and human in Christ, and we therefore hesitated to accept them. We learnt, however, from the Roman legates that neither do they admit any such separation, but confess one and the same Lord and Son of God. We have therefore assented, and have subscribed Leo's letter. It would be well, however, if the legates would now, for the good of the world, publicly repeat that explanation."¹

After these explanations of the bishops of Illyricum and Palestine, the individual voting was again continued, until at last the imperial commissioners, after a hundred and sixty-one votes had been given, invited all the rest to give their votes in union. Upon this all the bishops exclaimed: "We are all agreed, we all believe thus; he who agrees belongs to the Synod! Many years to the Emperors, many years to the Empress! Even the five bishops (Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius, Eustathius, and Basil) have subscribed, and believe as Leo does! They also belong to the Synod!" The imperial commissioners and others replied: "We have written on their account (those five) to the Emperor, and await his commands. You, however, are responsible to God for these five for whom you intercede, and for all the proceedings of this Synod." The bishops exclaimed: "God has deposed Dioscurus; Dioscurus is rightly condemned; Christ has deposed him!"²

The Synod now waited for several hours, until a decree arrived from the Emperor, who was close at hand in Constantinople, respecting the five bishops. It was to the effect that: "The Synod itself should decide as to their admission;" and as it now declared strongly for this by acclamations, they were immediately allowed to enter and take their places while their colleagues exclaimed: "God has done this. Many years to the Emperors, to the senate, to the commissioners! The union is complete, and peace given to the Churches!"³

The commissioners then made the communication that yesterday a number of Egyptian bishops had handed in a confession of faith to the Emperor, and the latter wished that it should be read before the Synod. They therefore allowed

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 31 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 402.

² Mansi, t. vii. pp. 34-47; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 403-414.

³ Mansi, t. vii. p. 47; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 414.

the Egyptian bishops, thirteen in number, to enter and to take their place, and the secretary Constantine read their short memorial addressed to the two Emperors in the name of all the bishops of Egypt, but signed only by the thirteen, in which they expressed their agreement with the orthodox faith, and anathematized all heresy, particularly that of Arius, Eunomius, the Manichæans, the Nestorians, and those who maintain that the flesh of Christ, which is like ours, with the exception of sin, came from heaven and not from the Virgin Mary.¹ As the heresy of Eutyches was not mentioned here, there immediately arose great discontent in the Synod on this account. Some even accused the Egyptians of dishonesty; but the papal legates desired from them a declaration as to whether they agreed with the letter of Leo, and would pronounce an anathema on Eutyches or not. They replied by their spokesman Hieracus, bishop of Aphnæum: "If any one teaches differently from what we have indicated, whether it be Eutyches or whoever it be, let him be anathema. As to the letter of Leo, however, we cannot express ourselves, for you all know that, in accordance with the prescription of the Nicene Council (canon 6), we are united with the Archbishop of Alexandria, and therefore must await his judgment (that is, of the future archbishop who should be chosen in the place of Dioscurus) in this matter."

Those who were present were highly displeased with this evasion, and expressed their feelings in various exclamations, so that the thirteen Egyptians after a short time pronounced an anathema openly and positively at least on Eutyches. But again they were asked to subscribe the letter of Leo, and when the Egyptians again said: "Without the consent of our Archbishop we cannot subscribe," Bishop Acacius of Ariarathia replied: "It is inadmissible to allow more weight to one single person who is to hold the bishopric of Alexandria, than to the whole Synod. The Egyptians only wish to throw everything into confusion here as at Ephesus. They must subscribe Leo's letter or be excommunicated." To the same effect spoke Bishop Photius of Tyre, and all the other bishops gave their approval. The Egyptians now explained that "in comparison

¹Mansi, t. vii. p. 50; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 415.

with the great number of the bishops of Egypt, there were only a few of them present, and they had no right to act in their name (to do what was required of them). They therefore prayed for mercy, and that they might be allowed to follow their Archbishop. All the provinces of Egypt would otherwise rise up against them." They even cast themselves upon their knees, and repeated their request for forbearance. But Cecropius of Sebastopol again reproached them with heresy, and remarked that it was from themselves alone that assent was demanded to the letter of Leo, and not in the name of the rest of the Egyptian bishops. They replied: "We can no longer live at home if we do this." The papal legate Lucentius said: "Ten individual men (the thirteen Egyptians) can occasion no prejudice to a Synod of six hundred bishops and to the Catholic faith." The Egyptians, however, went on crying: "We shall be killed, we shall be killed, if we do it. We will rather be made away with here by you than there. Let an Archbishop for Egypt be here appointed, and then we will subscribe and assent. Have pity upon our gray hairs! Anatolius of Constantinople knows that in Egypt all the bishops must obey the Archbishop of Alexandria. Have pity upon us; we would rather die by the hands of the Emperor and by yours than at home. Take our bishoprics if you will, elect an Archbishop of Alexandria, we do not object;" and so forth. In the midst of this the cry again broke out: "The Egyptians are heretics;" and "they must subscribe the condemnation of Dioscurus;" but the imperial commissioners and the senate suggested that they should remain at Constantinople until an archbishop was elected for Alexandria. The legate Paschasius agreed, adding: "They must give security not to leave Constantinople in the meantime;" and the commissioners and senators confirmed this demand.¹

Then, after permission obtained, there entered eighteen priests and archimandrites: Faustus, Martin, Peter, Manuel, Abraham, Job, Antiochus, Theodore, Paul, Jacob, Eusebius, Tryphon, Marcellus, Timothy, Pergamius, Peter, Asterius, and John, and were first asked whether Carosus, Dorotheus, and those others of Eutychian opinions who had presented a peti-

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 51-62; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 415-422.

tion to the Emperor Marcian before the opening of the Synod of Chalcedon, were really archimandrites or not. They affirmed it in reference to some, and denied it with regard to others; and requested that those should be punished who had falsely given themselves out for archimandrites and had no convents, but lived in martyrs' chapels and tombs (*in memoriis et monumentis*). These ought all to be driven out of the city, for they were not even monks.

The commissioners then gave orders for the introduction of the Eutychian petitioners in question, and these were the Archimandrites Carosus, Dorotheus, Elpidius, Photinus, Eutychius, Theodore, Moses, Maximus, Gerontius, Nemesinus, Theophilus, Thomas, Leontius, Hyspius, Gallinicus, Paul, Gaudentius and Eugnomenes, together with the monk Barsumas and the eunuch Calopodius. They declared themselves to be the authors of the petition to the Emperor which was produced; but Bishop Anatolius of Constantinople pointed out among them Gerontius and Calopodius as having been previously condemned for heresy, and required that they should be removed. Whether this was carried out the Acts do not say; but, on the contrary, we know that the petition of these Eutychian monks was now read. In it they say that "now everything is in confusion through self-seeking and the lack of brotherly love, and the apostolic faith is placed in doubt, while Jews and heathens, however bad they may be, are permitted to hold their position. These have peace, but Christians are in conflict with one another. To improve this state of things was the object of the Emperors; and they ought to prevent the outbreak of a schism. It was their duty to promulgate that which was right as a law, and to that end they should bring about the meeting of the Synod which had already been ordered. In the meantime, however, all disturbances should cease, particularly the enforcement of subscriptions and persecutions, which clerics were promoting against each other without the knowledge of the Emperor. In particular, the Emperor should not allow that any one should, before the sentence of the Synod, be driven from his convent, or his church, or his martyrs' chapel (*ἀπὸ μαρτυρίου*)."¹

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 66; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 423.

Among the Eutychian monks who had entered was that Barsumas, who had so greatly advanced the Eutychian cause in Syria, and had put himself so prominently forward at the Robber-Synod. Bishop Diogenes of Cyzicus therefore exclaimed: "This Barsumas, who is among them, killed Flavian;" and the other bishops added: "He threw all Syria into confusion, and brought a thousand monks against us." The imperial commissioners etc., immediately put the question to Carosus and his companions, "Whether they were inclined to learn the right faith from the Synod." They replied that, first of all, their second letter, addressed to the Synod itself, should be read; and the commissioners and senators agreed to this, whilst from many sides the cry broke forth: "Out with the murderer Barsumas."

In the letter to the Synod the Eutychians first excused themselves for not having appeared earlier in answer to the invitation, saying, "that the Emperor had not wished it, as they had already shown in writing. Now, however, they requested that the holy archbishop Dioscurus and his bishops should be admitted to the council."—Enraged at this boldness, the bishops interrupted the reading of the document, and cried: "Anathema to Dioscurus: Christ has deposed him, cast these out, wipe out the insult which they have offered to the Synod; their petition should no further be read, for they still call the deposed Dioscurus bishop, etc." The commissioners and senators, however, remarked that this would not create the slightest prejudice, and ordered the reading of the memorial to be continued. The archimandrites in question further maintained in it that "the Emperor had assured them that at the Synod only the faith of Nicaea would be confirmed, and that before this nothing else should be brought forward. With this imperial promise the condemnation of Dioscurus was irreconcilable, and therefore he and his bishops should again be summoned to the Synod, that thus the discord among orthodox people might cease. If, however, the Synod would not consent to this, then they would themselves have no communion with it, no communion with such as opposed the creed of the three hundred and eighteen fathers of Nicaea. Finally, in proof of their orthodoxy they had appended to their letter the Nicene

Creed, together with the Ephesine decree which confirmed it."¹

Aetius, Archdeacon of Constantinople, remarked that, according to the ecclesiastical rule, all clergymen and monks were bound to accept guidance in the faith from the bishops, and in proof of this he read from the collection of canons which was then made, the fifth Antiochene ordinance, which punishes with deposition a clergyman who separates from the communion of his bishop, without any hope of future restitution.² The imperial commissioners and the senate hereupon asked whether the archimandrites were now inclined to acquiesce in the doctrine of the present holy Synod. They replied that they would simply hold by the creed of Nicæa and the decree of the Synod of Ephesus. Aetius then stated that all who were present also observed most faithfully the declarations of faith of Nicæa and Ephesus; but as subsequently controversies had again broken out, and in opposition to these Cyril and Leo had in their writings *explained* (ἐρμηνεύειν) that creed, but had not *extended* (ἐκτίθημι) the faith and the dogma, but the whole Synod defined this, and imparted their explanation (that is, put it forth as a doctrinal form) to all who were desirous of learning, so they should also now declare whether they would consent to this decree of the Synod or not.

Carosus answered evasively, that "it certainly was not necessary for him to pronounce an anathema upon Nestorius, as he had pronounced it so often already;" but when Aetius requested him to pronounce an anathema on Eutyches, he replied: "Is it not written, Thou shalt not judge?" and "why do you speak, while the bishops sit silent?" Aetius then, in the name of the Synod, repeated the question: "Do you agree to their sentence?" Carosus replied again: "I hold by the creed of Nicæa; you may condemn me, and drive me into exile, but Paul has said: 'If any man preacheth unto you any other gospel than that which ye received, let him be anathema.'" By way of conciliating the Synod, he added

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 67-71; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 423 sqq.

² See vol. ii. p. 68. On the collection of canons which the Synod of Chalcedon had before it, and which they received into their own first canon, cf. Drey, *Die Constit. u. Canones der Apostel*, S. 427 ff.

further: "If Eutyches does not believe what the Catholic Church believes, let him be anathema."¹

The commissioners and senators then ordered that the memorial of the anti-Eutychian archimandrites, Faustus, Martinus, and others already mentioned, should also be read. These in their memorial commended the Emperor for having taken measures to suppress the Eutychian heresy, but at the same time complained of those monks who obstinately persisted in this heresy, and asked for permission to treat them in accordance with the rules of their order, and in this way to attempt to correct them. If this did not succeed, then it would be necessary that they should be suitably punished. Finally, they asked that the Emperor would allow them to give orders respecting the holes in which these beast-like men lived, and in which they daily insulted the Saviour.

The Archimandrite Dorotheus now took up the word and maintained the orthodoxy of Eutyches. The commissioners and the senate answered him: "Eutyches teaches that the body of the Saviour was not of our substance: what do you confess in this respect?" Instead of answering definitely, he recited the passage of the creed of Constantinople: *σαρκωθέντα ἐκ τῆς παρθένου καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα*, and added, in opposition to Nestorianism, "He in whose face they spat is Himself the Lord: we therefore confess that He who suffered is of the Trinity." The demand that he would subscribe the letter of Leo, he declined, however, and naturally, because from his point of view he was forced to avoid every more exact definition of the general expressions *σαρκωθέντα* and *ἐνανθρωπήσαντα* (*incarnate* and *made man*). So they did not care to avail themselves of the offer of a respite of two days, after the expiry of which they were to decide, and the commissioners and senators therefore invited the Synod to pronounce a judgment upon Carosus and his associates.²

In order to avoid this result, they now maintained that the Emperor had promised them to hold a disputation between them and their opponents, and thus to hear both sides. The commissioners and the Synod therefore sent the priest and

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 71-75; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 426-430.

² Mansi, t. vii. pp. 75-79; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 430 sq.

periodeutes¹ Alexander to the Emperor, to learn the truth of the matter, and when he returned, the bishops assembled on the 20th of October for a new session, which, however, is not generally reckoned in the number of the great sessions.² That the imperial commissioners and the senate were present there is clear from the Acts in the case of Bishop Photius of Tyre, which was considered at the same session. Alexander first gave information respecting the results of his mission, namely, that the Emperor had sent him and the decurion John to those monks, to say to them: "If I had myself wished to decide the controversy, I should not have called a Synod. As this, however, has assembled, and has given me information respecting you, I give command that you be present at it, and that you learn from it what you do not yet know. For what the holy and Œcumenical Synod decrees, that I follow, with that I am satisfied, that I believe."

On hearing these words of the Emperor, the Synod broke forth into acclamations. Then the memorial, already mentioned, of Carosus and his associates (p. 335) to the Emperor was read again as *corpus delicti*, and also some earlier canons, Nos. 4 and 5 of the Synod of Antioch of 341, which were the 83d and 84th in the collection used at Chalcedon. These were chosen as starting-points for the judgment to be pronounced. The well-known 4th canon of Antioch, for instance, is thus expressed: "If a bishop is deposed by a Synod, or a priest or deacon by his bishop, and he presumes to perform any function whatever in the Church as before, he may no longer hope for reinstatement." And canon 5 of Antioch says: "If a priest or deacon separates himself from his bishop, and holds a private service, and sets up a private altar, he shall be deposed without hope of restitution."³

In accordance with the wish of the imperial commissioners and the senate, the Synod did not immediately pronounce sentence of condemnation, but allowed the incriminated persons a respite of thirty days, reckoning from the 15th of October to the 15th of November. On the last day of this period, at the latest, they were required to declare their

¹ On this ecclesiastical office see vol. ii. p. 321.

² See the table given above, p. 287.

³ Cf. vol. ii. p. 68.

assent to the faith of the Synod, or they would be deposed from their rank, their dignity, and their office of archimandrites.¹

The Synod occupied itself no further with this matter; but we learn from Leo the Great that Carosus persevered in his Eutychian opposition, and was, by the Pope's advice, together with Dorotheus, expelled by the Emperor Marcian from his convent.²

On the same 20th of October the case of Bishop Photius of Tyre came before the Synod. Photius had at an earlier period appealed to the Emperor, but had by him been directed to the Synod. His memorial was as follows: "That Bishop Eustathius of Berytus had violated the rights of the Church of Tyre, and had procured permission under Theodosius II., by means of which he had ventured to consecrate bishops in certain cities of the ecclesiastical province of Tyre (subsequently he added that these had been the six following: Biblus, Botrys, Tripolis, Orthosias, Arcas, and Antaradon). At the same time, he had compelled him by threats to subscribe a synodal letter with reference to this. He now prayed that this act might be annulled, which had been extorted by violence, and therefore was void (even when he subscribed he had added that it was only extorted), and that the Church of Tyre might again be restored to the undisturbed enjoyment of her privileges."

Eustathius, in opposition to this, would willingly have supported himself upon the decree of the Emperor Theodosius; as, however, the commissioners and the Synod declared that not a decree, but the canons of the Church were the standard in such a case, he altered his plan of defence, and accused

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 79-83; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 431-435. The two series of transactions, that now related concerning Carosus, and the following in regard to Photius of Tyre, are not in the old Latin translation of the synodal Acts (the Latin translation printed in Hardouin, Mansi, etc., is from the editors of the Roman Collection of Councils. Cf. above, p. 290, and Baluz. in Mansi, t. vii. p. 663, n. xxvii.), and therefore their genuineness has been contested by some scholars. Cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. xv. note 47, *Sur St. Léon*, p. 917 sq. There are no valid grounds for this objection, and the Ballerini are quite right when they (*l.c.* t. ii. p. 510, nota 23) maintain that the two series of transactions on the 20th of October should properly be reckoned as the fifth (properly the fifth and sixth) session. Cf. above the table, p. 287.

² Leonis *Ep.* 136, n. 4, *Ep.* 141, n. 1, and *Ep.* 142, n. 2. In Mansi, t. vi. pp. 293, 304, 305.

Photius of slander. It was untrue, he said, that he had endeavoured to infringe the rights of the Church of Tyre; on the contrary, the Emperor Theodosius had freely raised Berytus to be a metropolis, and a Synod at Constantinople, under Anatolius (see above, p. 271 f.), had assigned those six cities to this new metropolis, and Maximus of Antioch had signed this decree.¹ The latter replied, in order as much as possible to diminish his share in the business, that "he himself had not, at that very time, been present in the Synod at Constantinople, but that the document referring to this matter had been brought to him in the house, and he, following Anatolius, had subscribed it" (see above, p. 272). Photius further complained that from the beginning he had not accepted this new arrangement, and in accordance with ancient right had consecrated three bishops; but for this he had been excommunicated, and the bishops consecrated by him had been deposed, and degraded to the priesthood. Anatolius did not deny this, but maintained that Photius had, by his disorderly conduct, caused the Synod (of Constantinople) to pronounce a sentence of excommunication against him. At the same time, he found it necessary to defend against various attacks the custom of Constantinople of holding a *σύνδος ἐνδημοῦσα* (cf. vol. i. p. 4) with the bishops who were at any particular time present in the city. After some further discussions, it was decided, on the ground of the fourth Nicene canon,² that in the one ecclesiastical province of Phœnicia I. there should be only

¹ There is no question that the Emperor had the power to raise Berytus, which had previously belonged to the civil and ecclesiastical province of Tyre, to be a special *civil* metropolis, which might easily have had as its result the founding of an *ecclesiastical* province of Berytus (cf. vol. i. p. 381 ff., and vol. ii. p. 69, canon 9; and below, the remarks on canon 12). But it appears that, in the case before us, the Emperor had by his own authority declared the city of Berytus an *ecclesiastical* metropolis, without at the same time raising its civil rank. That he had intruded improperly into the ecclesiastical sphere is clear from the expression above: "Not an imperial decree, but the canons of the Church were the standard in such a case," and from the resolution that all imperial decrees which were opposed to the canons should be invalid (p. 342). Moreover, it is also clear from the above that a Synod of Constantinople in true Byzantine fashion had lent a helping hand to give practical effect to the assumption of the Emperor.

² The same Nicene canon was read also in the thirteenth session, but from another codex. - Cf. Ballerini, *l.c.* t. iii. p. xxxvi. sq.

one metropolis, Tyre, and that only the Bishop of Tyre should undertake the ordination of the other bishops. The Bishop of Berytus must not appeal to the rights which Theodosius had accorded to him, and those three bishops whom Photius had ordained were to be recognized as bishops, and reinstated. —The papal legates added: "To degrade a bishop to the presbyterate is a sacrilege. If a bishop has committed a crime which deserves his deposition, he ought not to be even a priest." Anatolius wished to excuse what had been done, but the Synod agreed with the papal legates, and declared, on the suggestion of Bishop Cœropius of Sebastopolis, that all the imperial pragmatics (decrees) which are in opposition to the canons must be without effect.¹

SEC. 193. *Fifth Session, October 22, 451. The Decree concerning the Faith.*

At the fifth session, on the 22d of October, there were only three imperial commissioners, Anatolius, Palladius, and Vincomalus, and no senator present.² Among the bishops who were present, besides the Roman legates, the Greek Acts mention by name only the three of Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem; while the Latin translation mentions by name forty-seven more. The presence of the rest is expressed by the formula *καὶ τῆς λοιπῆς ἀγίας καὶ οἰκουμενικῆς συνόδου*. The object of the proceedings on this occasion was the establishment of the faith, and therefore this session is one of the most important in Christian antiquity. First, the deacon Asclepiades of Constantinople read a doctrinal formula, which had been unanimously approved on the previous day, October 21, in the commission appointed by Anatolius for that purpose (see p. 318 f.), which Anatolius also seems to have drawn up, as he afterwards defended it most warmly. This formula is not embodied in the Acts, and so has not come down to us; but Tillemont infers, from the

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 86-98; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 435-446.

² The Acts of this session are in Mansi, t. vii. pp. 97-118; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 446-456. Abridged in German in Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 452 ff.; Waleh, *l.c.* S. 370 ff. That the senators were not present at this session is clear and evident from the fact that in the Acts there is mention always made only of the *μεγαλειπρίπιστάτοι καὶ ἰνδοξάτατοι ἄρχοντες*, that is, the commissioners.

indications found in the Acts, that it contained the orthodox faith, but that, through a certain indefiniteness of expression, it had not sufficiently excluded heresy.¹—As soon as it was read in the fifth session, objections were raised against it, and Bishop John of Germanicia declared that this formula was not good, and that it must be improved. Anatolius replied, asking “whether it had not yesterday given universal satisfaction,” which produced the acclamation: “It is excellent, and contains the Catholic faith. Away with the Nestorians! The expression *θεοτόκος* must be received into the creed.”² The Roman legates judged otherwise. They, too, were dissatisfied with the formula which had been drawn up, and they had probably not been present at the session of the commission held for its confirmation. They now declared: “If the letter of Leo is not agreed to,³ we demand our papers, so that we may return home, and that a Synod may be held in the West.”

The imperial commissioners saw at once that the departure of the legates would necessarily frustrate the whole object of the Synod, the restoration of unity of faith in the Church, and therefore made the suggestion, for the satisfaction of both sides, that there should meet, in their presence, a commission of six Oriental bishops (from the patriarchate of Antioch), three Asiatic (from the exarchate of Ephesus), three Illyrian, three Pontic, and three Thracian bishops, with Anatolius and the Roman legates in the oratory of the Church of the Martyr (that is, S. Euphemia's Church, cf. p. 286), and communicate their decisions on the faith to the other bishops. The majority, however, wished to retain the doctrinal formula which had been read, and demanded in many acclamations that it should be subscribed by all, and that whoever did not agree to it should be excluded. At the same time, they charged Bishop John of Germanicia with Nestorianism.

¹ Tillemont, *l.c.* t. xv. p. 677. ² Mansi, t. vii. p. 99 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 447.

³ As this letter of Leo's had already been approved by the Synod (see pp. 317 and 331), this new demand must be understood to mean, “If they were not satisfied with this letter, and put forth another formula,” or “If, in the formula of faith to be put forth, they did not adhere closely enough to the contents and meaning of this letter.” According to what follows, the latter is the true meaning. (See below, p. 344.)

The commissioners remarked: "Dioscurus asserts that he condemned Flavian for having maintained that there are two natures in Christ; in the new doctrinal formula, however, it stands: Christ is of two natures." They meant by this to say that the very term which had already been used by Flavian for the refutation of Monophysitism ought to have been adopted in the new formula, since the expression selected in it, "of two natures," although certainly orthodox, yet might also be understood in the sense of Dioscurus, and therefore would necessarily give offence.—How correct this criticism was¹ is shown by the remark of Anatolius, made directly afterwards, that Dioscurus had been deposed, not on account of false doctrine, but because he had excommunicated the Pope, and had not obeyed the Synod.² Without going further into this question, the commissioners again endeavoured to bring the Synod into the right path, by the remark that the Synod had already approved of Leo's letter; and if this had been done, then that which was contained in the letter (that there were actually two natures in Christ unmingled) must be confessed.—As, however, the majority, and even Eusebius of Dorylæum, persisted in their acclamations in favour of the formula of Anatolius, the commissioners immediately acquainted the Emperor with it,³ and the latter speedily sent a decree, saying that "either the proposed commission of bishops must be accepted, or they must individually declare their faith through their metropolitans, so that all doubt might be dispelled, and all discord removed. If they would do neither of these things, then a Synod must be held in the West, since they refused here (at Chalcedon) to give a definite and stable declaration respecting the faith."⁴

Again the majority exclaimed: "We abide by the formula (of Anatolius) or we go!" Cecropius of Sebastopolis in par-

¹ Perhaps the imperial commissioners, who here and in what followed united to much practical skill also theological insight, may have been advised by the papal legates.

² In the synodal decree despatched to Dioscurus (p. 328 f.) there is certainly no express reference to his heresy, nor yet in the sentence which the papal legates pronounced against him. (See p. 328.)

³ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 102, 103; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 47 sqq.

⁴ Mansi, t. vii. p. 103 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 450.

ticular said: "Whoever will not subscribe it can go (to Rome to the intended Synod)." So the bishops of Illyricum cried out: "Whoever opposes it is a Nestorian; these can go to Rome!" Again the commissioners explained: "Dioscurus has rejected the expression, 'there are two natures in Christ,' and, on the contrary, has accepted, 'of two natures;' Leo, on the other hand, says: 'In Christ there are two natures united, *ἀσυνχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, and ἀδιαίρετως*;' ¹ which will you follow, the most holy Leo or Dioscurus?" At this alternative all the bishops exclaimed: "We believe with Leo, not with Dioscurus; whoever opposes this is an Eutychian." The commissioners immediately pressed the logical consequence: "Then you must also receive into the creed the doctrine of Leo, which has been stated."²

Whether anything, and if so what, was here objected by the majority we do not know. It is apparent that there is here a break in the minutes, since, without anything more and without any indication of the reason for the alteration which was introduced, they go on to relate that the whole of the members of the Synod now asked for the meeting of the commission which they had previously opposed. As members of the commission were Anatolius of Constantinople, the three legates, Paschasinus, Lucentius, and Boniface, Bishop Julian of Cos also representing the Pope (see p. 296), Maximus of Antioch, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Cæsarea, Eusebius of Ancyra, Quintillus, Atticus, and Sozon from Illyria, Diogenes of Cyzicus, Leontius of Magnesia, Florentius of Sardis, Eusebius of Dorylæum, Theodore of Tarsus, Cyrus of Anazarbus, Constantine of Bostra, Theodore of Claudiopolis in Isauria, Francion, Sebastian, and Basil of Thrace. It may be seen that there were many among these who formerly had vehemently supported the formula "of two natures," as Anatolius and the Illyrians, and some had even been heads of the Robber-Synod and

¹ In Leo's letter this expression does not occur verbally, but the legates had previously (see p. 331) explained this as the chief point of the letter, which at that time had been very readily accepted by those bishops who had still some objections to the letter.

² Mansi, t. vii. p. 106; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 450.

friends of Dioscurus. How long they consulted in the oratory of S. Euphemia the Martyr is unknown; the Acts only mention that they returned again to the church, and that Aetius then read the formula which they had drawn up. It says: "The holy and great and Œcumenical Synod, . . . at Chalcedon in Bithynia, . . . has defined as follows: Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, when confirming the faith in His disciples, declared: 'Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you,' so that no one might be separated from his neighbour in the doctrines of religion, but that the preaching of the truth should be made known to all alike. As, however, the evil one does not cease by his tares to hinder the seed of religion, and is ever inventing something new in opposition to the truth, therefore has God, in His care for the human race, stirred up zeal in this pious and orthodox Emperor, so that he has convoked the heads of the priesthood in order to remove all the plague of falsehood from the sheep of Christ, and to nourish them with the tender plants of truth. This we have also done in truth, since we have expelled, by our common judgment, the doctrines of error, and have renewed the right faith of the fathers, have proclaimed the creed of the 318 to all, and have acknowledged the 150 of Constantinople who accepted it, as our own. While we now receive the regulations of the earlier Ephesine Synod, under Cœlestine and Cyril, and its prescriptions concerning the faith, we decree that the confession of the 318 fathers at Nicæa is a light to the right and unblemished faith, and that that is also valid which was decreed by the 150 fathers at Constantinople for the confirmation of the Catholic and apostolic faith."¹

After a literal insertion of the Creed of Nicæa and Constantinople, it goes on: "This wise and wholesome symbol of divine grace would indeed suffice for a complete knowledge and confirmation of religion, for it teaches everything with reference to the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, and declares the incarnation of the Lord to those who receive it in faith; as, however, those who would do away with the preaching of the truth devised vain expressions through their

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 167; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 451.

own heresies, and, on the one side, dared to destroy (*παραφθείρειν*) the mystery of the incarnation of our Lord (*τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου οἰκονομίας μυστήριον*), and rejected the designation of God-bearer, and, on the other side, introduced a *σύγχυσις* and *κρᾶσις*, that is, a mixture and confusion (of the natures), and, contrary to reason, imagined only one nature of the flesh and of the Godhead (*μίαν εἶναι φύσιν τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῆς θεότητος ἀνόητως ἀναπλάττοντες*), and rashly maintained that the divine nature of the Only-begotten was, by the mixture, become passible (*παθητὴν τοῦ μονογενοῦς τὴν θείαν φύσιν τῇ συγχύσει τερατευόμενοι*), therefore the holy, great, and Œcumenical Synod decrees that the faith of the 318 fathers shall remain inviolate, and that the doctrine afterwards promulgated by the 150 fathers at Constantinople on account of the Pneumatomachi (*διὰ τοὺς τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ μαχομένους*) shall have equal validity, being put forth by them, not in order to add to the creed of Nicæa anything that was lacking, but in order to make known in writing their consciousness (*ἐννοιαν*) concerning the Holy Ghost against the deniers of His glory. On account of those, however, who endeavoured to destroy the mystery of the Incarnation (*οἰκονομίας μυστήριον*), and who, boldly insulting Him who was born of the holy Mary, affirmed that He was a mere man, the holy Synod has accepted as valid the synodal letters of S. Cyril to Nestorius and to the Orientals in opposition to Nestorianism, and has added to them the letter of the holy Archbishop Leo of Rome, written to Flavian for the overthrow of the Eutychian errors, as agreeing with the doctrine of S. Peter and as a pillar against all heretics, for the confirmation of the orthodox dogmas.¹ The Synod opposes those who seek to rend the mystery of the Incarnation into a duality of Sons, and excludes from holy communion those who venture to declare the Godhead of the Only-begotten as capable of suffering, and opposes those who imagine a mingling and a confusion of the two natures of Christ, and drives away those who foolishly maintain that the servant-form of the Son, assumed from us, is from a heavenly substance (*οὐσία*), or any other (than ours),

¹ From here to the end, on account of the great importance of this formula, will be added the Greek text (see p. 349).

and anathematizes those who fable that before the union there were two natures of our Lord, but after the union only one. Following, therefore, the holy fathers, we all teach with one accord one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect in His Godhead and perfect in His manhood, true God and true man, consisting of a reasonable soul and of a body, of one substance with the Father as touching the Godhead, and of one substance with us as touching the manhood, like unto us in everything, sin excepted, according to the Godhead begotten of the Father before all time, but in the last days, for us men and for our salvation, according to the manhood, born of the Virgin Mary, the God-bearer, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord,—only-begotten, confessed in two natures,¹ without confusion, without change, without rending or separation; while the difference of the natures is in no way denied by reason of the union, on the other hand, the peculiarity of each nature

¹ The present Greek text has *ἰν δύο φύσιν*, while the old Latin translation has, *IN duabus naturis* (see p. 290). After what had been repeatedly said in this session on the difference between “in two natures” and “of two natures,” and in opposition to the latter formula (see p. 343), there can be no doubt whatever that the old Latin translator had the more accurate text before him, and that it was originally *ἰν δύο φύσιν*. This, however, is not mere supposition, but is expressly testified by antiquity: (1) by the famous Abbot Euthymius of Palestine, a contemporary of the Council of Chalcedon, of whose disciples several were present as bishops at our Council (cf. Baron. *ad ann.* 451, n. 152 sq.). We still have a judgment of his which he gave respecting the decree of Chalcedon concerning the faith, and in which he repeats the leading doctrine in the words of the Synod itself. At our passage he remarks: *ἰν δύο φύσιν γνωρίζεσθαι ὁμολογεῖ τὸν Ἰησὺ Χριστὸν κ.τ.λ.* The fragment of his writings on the subject is found in the *Vita S. Euthymii Abbatis*, written by his pupil Cyril in the *Analecta Græca* of the monks of S. Maur, t. i. p. 57, printed in Mansi, t. vii. p. 774 sq. (2) The second ancient witness is Severus, from A.D. 513 Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, who represents it as a great reproach and an unpardonable offence in the fathers of Chalcedon that they had declared: *ἰν δύο φύσιν ἀδιαίρετοις γνωρίζεσθαι τὸν Χριστὸν* (see the *Sententie Severi* in Mansi, t. vii. p. 839). (3) Somewhat more than a hundred years after the Council of Chalcedon, Evagrius copied its decree concerning the faith in *extenso* into his *Church History* (lib. ii. 4), and, in fact, with the words: *ἰν δύο φύσιν ἀσυγχύτως κ.τ.λ.* (ed. Mog. p. 294). (4) In the conference on religion held between the Severians and the orthodox at Constantinople, A.D. 553, the former reproached the Synod of Chalcedon with having put *IN duabus naturis*, instead of *EX duabus naturis*, as Cyril and the old fathers had taught (Mansi, t. viii. p. 892; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 1162). (5) Leontius of Byzantium maintains quite distinctly, in the year 610, in his work *De Sectis*, that the Synod taught *ἰνα Χριστὸν ἰν δύο φύσιν ἀσυγχύτως κ.τ.λ.* It is clear that, if any doubt had then existed as to the correct reading, Leontius could not have

is preserved, and both concur in one Person and Hypostasis. We do not confess One separated into two persons, but one and the same Son and only-begotten and God the Logos, the Lord Jesus Christ . . . as the prophets announced of Him, and He Himself taught us, and the creed of the fathers has handed down to us. As we have defined this distinction with great and universal exactness and care, the holy and Œcumenical Synod decreed, that none shall advance or write down or encourage another faith, or teach it to others; and those who, passing over from heathenism or Judaism, or from any heresy, give another faith or another creed, if they are bishops or clerics, shall be deposed from their bishopric or clerical office, and if they are monks or laymen, shall be excommunicated." (*Τοῖς τε γὰρ εἰς νῦν δυνάδα τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας διασπᾶν ἐπιχειροῦσι μυστήριον παρατάττεται, καὶ τοὺς παθητὴν τοῦ μονογενοῦς λέγειν τολμῶντας τὴν θεότητα, τοῦ τῶν ἱερῶν*

opposed the Monophysites with such certainty. The passage adduced by him is *Actio* iv. c. 7, in Galland. *Bibliotheca PP.* t. xii. p. 633. Gieseler (*Kirchengesch.* i. S. 465), and after him Hahn (*Biblioth. der Symbole*, S. 118, note 6), cites incorrectly the fourth instead of the fifth *Actio*. Perhaps neither of them had consulted the passage itself. (6) No less weight is to be attached to the fact that all the Latin translations, that of Rusticus and those before him, have in *duabus naturis*; and (7) that the Lateran Synod, A.D. 649, had the same reading in their Acts (Hardouin, t. iii. p. 835). (8) Pope Agatho, also, in his letter to the Emperor Constans II., which was read in the sixth Œcumenical Synod, adduced the creed of Chalcedon with the words in *duabus naturis* (in the Acts of the sixth Œcumenical Council, *Actio* iv.; in Mansi, t. xi. p. 256; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 1091). — In consequence of this, most scholars of recent times, e.g. Tillemont, Walch (*Biblioth. symbol. veter.* p. 106), Hahn (*l.c.*), Gieseler (*l.c.*), Neander (Abthl. ii. 2 of Bd. iv. S. 988), have declared *iv δύο φύσεων* to be the original and correct reading. Neander adds: "The whole process of the transactions of the Council shows this (that *iv δύο* is the correct reading). Evidently the earlier creed, which was more favourable to the Egyptian doctrine, contained the *ix δύο φύσεων*, and the favour shown to the other party came out chiefly in the change of the *ix* into *iv*. The expression *ix δύο φύσεων*, besides, does not fit the place, the verb *γνωρίζμενον* points rather to the original *iv*. The *iv δύο φύσεων* or *ix δύο φύσεων* was the turning-point of the whole controversy between Monophysitism and Dyophysitism." Cf., on the other side, Baur, *Trinitätslehre*, Bd. i. S. 820, and Dorner (*Lehre v. der Person Christi*, Thl. ii. S. 129), where it is maintained that *ix* is the correct and original reading, but that it was from the beginning purposely altered by the Westerns into *iv*; moreover, that *ix* fits better than *iv* with *γνωρίζμενον*, and therefore that it had been allowed as a concession to the ears of the Monophysites. The meaning, moreover, they say, of *ix* and *iv* is essentially the same, and the one and the other alike excluded Monophysitism.

ἀποθεῖται συλλόγου, καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν δύο φύσεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ κρᾶσιν ἢ σύγχυσιν ἐπινοοῦσιν ἀνθίσταται· καὶ τοὺς οὐρανίου ἢ ἐτέρας τινὸς ὑπάρχειν οὐσίας τὴν ἐξ ἡμῶν ληφθεῖσαν αὐτῷ τοῦ δούλου μορφὴν παραπαίοντας ἐξελαύνει· καὶ τοὺς δύο μὲν πρὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως φύσεις τοῦ κυρίου μυθεύοντας, μίαν δὲ μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν ἀναπλάττοντας, ἀναθεματίζει. Ἐπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκομεν, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, Θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῶς τὸν αὐτὸν, ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν, χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας· πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν, υἱὸν, κύριον, μονογενῆ, ἐκ δύο φύσεων [ἐν δύο φύσεσιν, see p. 348, note], ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον· οὐδαμῶς τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν, σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ιδιότητος ἐκατέρας φύσεως, καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρόμενον, ἀλλ' ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν καὶ μονογενῆ, Θεὸν λόγον, κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσε καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον. Τούτων τοίνυν μετὰ πάσης πανταχόθεν ἀκριβείας τε καὶ ἐμμελείας παρ' ἡμῶν διατυπωθέντων, ὥρισεν ἡ ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ σύνοδος, ἑτέραν πίστιν μηδεὶ ἐξεῖναι προφέρειν ἢ γοῦν συγγράφειν ἢ συντιθεῖν ἢ φρονεῖν ἢ διδάσκειν ἑτέρους· τοὺς δὲ τολμώντας ἢ συντιθεῖν πίστιν ἑτέραν ἢ γοῦν προκομίζειν ἢ διδάσκειν ἢ παραδιδόναι ἕτερον σύμβολον τοῖς ἐθέλουσιν ἐπιστρέφειν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐξ Ἑλληνισμοῦ ἢ ἐκ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ ἢ γοῦν ἐξ αἱρέσεως οἰασθηποτοῦν, τούτους, εἰ μὲν εἴεν ἐπίσκοποι ἢ κληρικοὶ, ἄλλοτρίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐπισκόπους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, καὶ τοὺς κληρικοὺς τοῦ κλήρου· εἰ δὲ μονάζοντες ἢ λαϊκοὶ εἴεν, ἀναθεματίζεσθαι αὐτοίς.)¹

After the reading of this confession of faith, all the bishops

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 111–118; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 454 sqq.

exclaimed: "This is the faith of the fathers. The Metropolitans must immediately subscribe, and in the presence of the imperial commissioners. Definitions so good can allow of no delay: this is the faith of the apostles, we all agree to it, we all think thus." In consequence of these acclamations the imperial commissioners gave the assurance that they would communicate to the Emperor that which the fathers (that is, the bishops chosen to draw up the decree on the faith) had set forth, and all had approved.¹

To this time probably belongs that *allocutio* (προσφωνητικός) of the Synod to the Emperor Marcian, which Mansi² and Hardouin³ give only at the end of all the minutes of the Synod, but which decidedly belongs to the earlier times of our Synod, and was sent to the Emperor in *writing*, either after the end of the fifth session (the commissioners promised to inform him), or was *verbally* brought forward in the succeeding sixth session, when the Emperor was personally present. The latter theory best agrees with the title προσφωνητικός or *allocutio*; yet Facundus says,⁴ although he also uses the expression *allocutio*, that it was *written* to the Emperor; and Tillemont⁵ held this to be the more probable. In this *allocutio* it is said: "God has given the Synod a champion against every error, in the person of the Roman bishop, who, like the fiery Peter, wishes to lead every one to God. And let no one venture to say, in order to avoid the refutation of his error, that the letter of Leo is contrary to the canons, since it is not allowed to set up a different confession of faith from the Nicene. The latter is certainly sufficient for the faithful, but those who endeavour to destroy the faith must be opposed and their objections must be suitably met, not in order to add anything *new* to the Nicene faith, but in order to refute the *innovations of heretics*. Thus, *e.g.*, the orthodox faith in regard to the Holy Ghost is already expressed in the words (of the Nicene Creed): 'And I believe in the Holy Ghost,' and these are sufficient for the orthodox; but on account of the Pneu-

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 118; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 455.

² T. vii. p. 455.

³ T. ii. p. 643.

⁴ *Defensio trium capitulorum*, lib. ii. c. 2, in Galland. *l.c.* t. xi. p. 679.

⁵ T. xv. p. 714 sq.

matomachi, the fathers (at the second Œcumenical Synod) added besides: 'The Holy Ghost is Lord and God, proceeding from the Father.' So also, the doctrine of the Incarnation was contained in the Nicene Creed in the words: 'He came down and was made flesh and man' (*κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα*);¹ but Satan seduced many, some to deny the birth of God from the Virgin, and to reject the expression *θεοτόκος*, others to declare the Godhead of the Son to be mutable and passible (*τρεπτὴν καὶ παθητὴν*); the one to efface the character (*τὰ γνωρίσματα* = characteristic marks) of the humanity assumed by God; the other to assert the union of the Godhead merely with the body of a man, but not with the soul, at least not with a reasonable soul;² the one to deny the mystery of the union (of the natures) and to teach that the manifestation (*τὸ φαινόμενον*) was that of a mere man, like a prophet; the other to give up the distinction of the natures; therefore the fathers, Basil the Great, Pope Damasus, etc., and the Synods of Sardica³ and Ephesus have thought new explanations of the old Nicene faith necessary. But it could not be said: At this (the explanation of Ephesus, etc.) we are bound to stop, because the heretics will not stop, and the holy Cyril in his letter to the Orientals, as well as Proclus of Constantinople and John of Antioch, regarded new definitions as necessary. No one, therefore, must accuse the letter of the admirable Bishop of Rome of innovation. Leo has, in fact, altered *nothing* in the faith proclaimed by the fathers."

In proof of this, the Synod added a series of more ancient patristic passages from Basil the Great, Ambrose, Gregory of Nazianzus, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Cyril, and others.⁴—Tillemont and Remi Ceillier remark that this allocution to the Emperor probably proceeded from the papal legates, being first drawn up in Latin and afterwards translated into Greek by others. This, they think, is clear partly from the fact that it treats simply and solely of the Pope's *Epistola dogmatica*, and forms

¹ Cf. vol. i. p. 293.

² Cf. vol. i. p. 238, and vol. ii. p. 278.

³ They cited here the *Decretum de fide*, which had been projected, but not approved, at Sardica. Cf. vol. ii. p. 106 ff.

⁴ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 455-474; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 643-654; Fuchs, *Biblioth. der Kirchenvers.* Bd. iv. S. 516 ff.

its apology and panegyric, and partly from the fact that the Latin text of this allocution, which has come down to us, does not bear the character of a translation, but is more elegant than the Latin version of the other Acts of Chalcedon.¹

SEC. 194. *Sixth Session, October 25, 451.*

Peculiarly solemn was the sixth session,² since both the Emperor Marcian and the Empress Pulcheria, with a large suite, and with all the commissioners and the senate, were present at it.³ The Emperor opened the session with a speech in the first place spoken in Latin, in which he said: "From the beginning of his reign he had had the purity of the faith peculiarly at heart. As now, through the avarice or perversity of some (*avaritia vel pravis studiis quorundam*), many had been seduced to error, he had summoned the present Synod, so that all error and all obscurity might be dispelled, that religion might shine forth in the power of its light, and that no one should in future venture further to maintain concerning the birth (Incarnation) of our Lord and Saviour, anything else than that which the apostolic preaching and the decree, in accordance therewith, of the 318 holy fathers had handed down to posterity, and which was also testified by the letter of the holy Pope Leo of Rome to Flavian. In order to strengthen the faith, but not at all to exercise violence, he had wished, after the example of Constantine, to be personally present at the Synod, so that the nations might not be still more widely separated by false opinions. His efforts were directed to this, that all, becoming one in the true doctrine, might return to the same religion and honour the true Catholic faith. Might God grant this!"⁴

¹ Tillemont, *l.c.* t. xv. p. 713; Remi Ceillier, *Histoire des auteurs sacrés*, t. xiv. p. 690; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* Bd. xviii. S. 491 ff.

² The Acts of this session are in Mansi, t. vii. pp. 118-178; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 458-491. German abridgment in Fuchs, *l.c.* Thl. iv. S. 459 ff.; Walch, *l.c.* S. 375 ff.

³ Quesnel has thrown doubt upon the presence of the Empress, because only the Latin Acts refer to her; but the letter of Bishop Anatolius of Constantinople to Pope Leo, No. 101 among the letters of Leo, confirms the intimation of the Latin Acts. See the edition of the Ballerini, *l.c.*, and Mansi, t. vi. p. 175.

⁴ Mansi, t. vii. p. 129 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 463 sqq.

All exclaimed: "Many years to the Emperor, many years to the Empress; he is the only son of Constantine. Prosperity to Marcian, the new Constantine!" Almost the same acclamation was repeated after the speech of the Emperor had been translated into Greek; and then Archdeacon Aetius read, from beginning to end, the declaration concerning the faith which had been set forth in the previous session, and which was now subscribed by 355 bishops in their own names and in the names of their absent colleagues (see p. 346 ff.).¹

The Emperor asked whether the view of all was expressed in the formula which had been read, and the bishops answered with the exclamation: "We all believe thus, there is one faith, one will; we are all unanimous, and have unanimously subscribed; we are all orthodox! This is the faith of the fathers, the faith of the apostles, the faith of the orthodox; this faith has saved the world. Prosperity to Marcian, the new Constantine, the new Paul, the new David! You are the peace of the world! . . . Thou hast strengthened the orthodox faith! Many years to the Empress! You are the lights of the orthodox faith, by which peace everywhere prevails! Marcian is the new Constantine, Pulcheria the new Helena," etc.

The Emperor thereupon gave thanks to Christ that unity in religion had again been restored, and threatened all, as well private men and soldiers as the clergy, with heavy punishment if they should again stir up controversies respecting the faith, and proposed three ordinances on the erection of convents, on the worldly affairs of the clergy and monks, and on the removal of the clergy from one church to another, the publication of which was more suitable for the Synod than for an imperial law, and which he would therefore leave to the Synod, to show his respect for it.² The Synod received these ordinances into the number of its canons as 4, 3, and 20.

Again followed acclamations, such as: "Thou art priest and Emperor together, conqueror in war and teacher of the faith!" At the close the Emperor declared that, in honour

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 135-169; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 466-486.

² Mansi, t. vii. pp. 170-175; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 486 sqq.

of S. Euphemia and of the Council, he would grant the title of metropolis to the city of Chalcedon without prejudice to the dignity of Nicomedia; and again all exclaimed: "This is just; an Easter (= unity) be over the whole world; . . . the holy Trinity will protect thee; we pray dismiss us." Marcian, however, requested that they would remain three or four days longer, and, in communion with his commissioners, continue the proceedings, and he forbade all earlier departure.¹

With the sixth session ended the principal work of the Synod of Chalcedon. What was further done was only of secondary importance.²

SEC. 195. *Seventh and Eighth Sessions, October 26, 451.*

The occasion for the seventh session³ was furnished by certain controversies respecting jurisdiction between Maximus of Antioch and Juvenal of Jerusalem. Both had in this matter appealed to the Emperor, and he had charged his commissioners at the Synod to settle the controversy. At their request the two archbishops had had an interview, and had, in fact, discovered a mode of compromise which, without putting it upon paper, they made known to the imperial commissioners. These, at the seventh session, at which, moreover, there were again only three of them present, requested the two archbishops to bring their agreement before the Synod, so that it might be confirmed by the bishops as well as by them (the commissioners). Responding to this wish, Maximus of Antioch explained that "after tedious controversies with Juvenal, they had agreed that the see of S. Peter at Antioch should (besides its other provinces) have the two Phœnicias and Arabias, and that the see of Jerusalem should have the three Palestines under it. The Synod was requested to confirm this agreement in writing." The same was repeated

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 178; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 490 sq.

² Cf. the letter of Pope Pelagius II. to the Istrian bishops in Mansi, t. ix. p. 448; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 434 sq.

³ Its Acts are in Mansi, t. vii. pp. 178-184; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 491-495; defective extract in Fuchs, l.c. S. 463.

by Juvenal, and all the bishops, the papal legates at their head, confirmed the understanding. So did the imperial commissioners. Subsequently the matter again came under discussion on the 31st of October, and was confirmed anew.¹

As we know, Juvenal, trusting in the friendship of Cyril, had already endeavoured, at the third Œcumenical Synod at Ephesus, to subject the provinces of Palestine, Phœnicia, and Arabia to himself. But Cyril opposed him.² The Emperor Theodosius II., however, by an authoritative order had assigned these provinces to the patriarchate of Jerusalem. As Antioch was by this means prejudiced and its jurisdiction diminished, it protested repeatedly against the decision, but in vain, until the compromise described was arranged at Chalcedon.³

On the same 26th of October, probably in the afternoon, the eighth session was held, again in the presence of only three imperial commissioners (the same who were present at the seventh and fifth sessions).⁴ Many bishops demanded that the celebrated Theodoret of Cyrus, formerly the opponent of Cyril and the friend of Nestorius, should now pronounce an anathema upon Nestorius. He stepped forward and said: "I have presented a petition to the Emperor, and a paper to the Roman legates, and wish it to be read, so that you may know how I think." The bishops, however, exclaimed: "We will have no reading; anathematize Nestorius at once!" Theodoret replied: "By God's grace I was brought up by orthodox parents, and received orthodox instruction, and have been orthodox in my teaching, and reject not only Nestorius and Eutyches, but every one who is not of orthodox opinions." When the bishops thereupon demanded that he should explain himself more clearly, and pronounce distinctly an anathema

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 179 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 491 sqq. A very ancient Latin translation of the minutes of the agreement between Antioch and Jerusalem was edited by the Ballerini in their edition of the works of Leo, t. ii. p. 1223. They maintain that the text which lies at the foundation of this ancient version (see below, p. 370, note 2) is the best. *Ibid.* p. 1231, n. 10, and p. 1233.

² Cf. vol. i. p. 407 f., and vol. iii. p. 77.

³ Cf. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, t. iii. p. 113 sqq.; Wiltsh, *Handb. der Kirchl. Geographie und Statistik*, 1846, Bd. i. S. 207.

⁴ Its Acts are in Mansi, t. vii. pp. 185-194; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 495-502; Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 464 f.

upon Nestorius and his adherents, he answered: "In truth I say nothing, unless I know that it is pleasing to God. First of all, I assure you that with me there is no question as to a bishopric or about honour, and I am not come here for that reason, but because I have been slandered. I came to prove that I am orthodox, and that I anathematize Nestorius and Eutyches, and every one who (like Nestorius) believes in two Sons." The bishops again interrupted, crying: "Pronounce distinctly an anathema upon Nestorius;" and Theodoret proceeded: "If I have not already explained how I believe, I cannot do so," and would have begun to explain his faith. They then shouted again: "He is a heretic, a Nestorius; out with him!" And now Theodoret declared: "Anathema to Nestorius, and to every one who does not call the holy Virgin Mary God-bearer, and who divides the one Son, the only-begotten, into two Sons. Moreover, I have subscribed the definition of faith by the Synod and the letter of Leo; and thus I think."

The imperial commissioners now took up the word, and said: "Every doubt in regard to Theodoret is now removed, for he has anathematized Nestorius in your presence, and has been (previously) received again by the holy Archbishop Leo; it now only remains that by your judgment also he receive again his bishopric, as Leo has already assured him." All cried out: "Theodoret is worthy of the bishopric; the Church must again receive the orthodox teacher," and the like. And when the special voting, and first the legates and patriarchs, and after them a few of the most distinguished bishops, had pronounced for the reinstatement of Theodoret, all the others gave their assent by acclamation, and the commissioners declared that, "accordingly, by the decree of the holy Council, Theodoret shall receive again the church of Cyrus." At the demand of the Synod, Bishops Sophronius of Constantina in Osrhoene, John of Germanicia in Syria, and Amphilochius of Sida in Pamphylia were next required to pronounce an anathema on Nestorius.¹

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 187 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 498 sqq.

SEC. 196. *Ninth and Tenth Sessions, October 27 and 28, 451.*

According to the Latin Acts, a third session (the ninth general) took place on the same 26th of October; but the Greek Acts, on the contrary, transfer it to the following day, the 27th of October.¹ Again there were present only the three imperial commissioners whom we have already several times mentioned; and Ibas, formerly bishop of Edessa, came forward to complain that, at the Robber-Synod, through the intrigues of Eutyches, he had been ill-treated and, although absent, had been unjustly deposed. The Emperor had now directed him to bring his petition before the Synod, in order to prove his case. They could therefore read the judgment spoken of him by Photius of Tyre and Eustathius of Berytus at the assemblies at Berytus and Tyre (see above, p. 179 ff.). Bishop Uranius of Himeria had then, from friendship for Eutyches, had him accused by several clerics, and had brought it about that the sentence should be given by him and the two bishops named, Photius and Eustathius. Nevertheless, the accusations had been discovered to be false, and he himself to be orthodox. Therefore he asked that the Synod would declare invalid all that had been done against him at Ephesus (at the Robber-Synod, cf. p. 259), and would reinstate him in his bishopric and his church. His orthodoxy was attested by all the clergy of Edessa, and he was free from the alleged heresy. The papal legates recommended that, in accordance with his request, the Acts of the earlier proceedings against him should be read; and those of Tyre were taken first, although (as we have already seen, p. 181) these proceedings were probably the later, and for this very reason—that they contained the later decision respecting Ibas—it was thought sufficient to read the Acts of this assembly. The accusers of Ibas, on the contrary, demanded, as we shall see, at the tenth session, that the Acts of Berytus, which were less favourable for Ibas, should also be read.

From the Acts of Tyre, we see that the judges appointed to

¹ Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. vi. S. 379, and after him Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 466, have here interchanged the Greek and Latin Acts in reference to the date. The Acts of this session are in Mansi, t. vi. pp. 194-203; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 502 sqq.

consider the case of Ibas endeavoured to make peace between Ibas and his accusers, and succeeded in doing so. To this end they wished that Ibas should put forth a confession of his faith, and he did so to their full satisfaction. He promised publicly to anathematize Nestorius and his adherents in a sermon in his church, and declared that "he believed entirely the same as that which John of Antioch and Cyril had agreed together upon (see p. 135 ff.), and assented to all that which the recent Synod at Constantinople (under Flavian) and the Ephesine (under Cyril) had decreed; he valued the latter as highly as the Nicene, and believed that there was no difference between them." Upon this the judges (Photius and others) commended him, and requested that Ibas would pardon his accusers and love them again as sons, and that they should honour him as their father. Ibas promised on oath, as far as he was concerned, and added two other points: (*a*) that the revenues of his church should in future be administered, in the Antiochene manner, by clerical stewards; and (*b*) that, in case one of his accusers should afterwards seem to deserve punishment, he would not himself pass judgment upon him, because he might still perhaps have a disinclination to him, but hand the matter over to the judgment of Archbishop Domnus of Antioch.¹

After the reading of these older Acts, the papal legates put to Photius and Eustathius the question, whether they would still hold to their former judgment that Ibas was innocent; and they asserted that it was so, and then the final judgment was deferred to the next session.

This, the tenth session, was celebrated, according to the Greek Acts, on the 28th, according to the Latin Acts, on the 27th of October,² and Ibas again complained of having suffered wrong. He had not only been unjustly deposed, but had been shut up in twenty prisons or more, and had first learnt, while in prison at Antioch, that he had been deposed. He added the petition that the sentence pronounced against him should

¹ The Acts referring to this matter are in the minutes of the ninth session of Chalcedon, in Mansi, t. vii. p. 198 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 503 sqq.

² Its Acts are in Mansi, t. vii. pp. 203-271; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 507-546; cf. Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 470 ff.; Walch, *l.c.* S. 380.

be declared invalid. The imperial commissioners invited the bishops to express their view on this matter, and a great part, particularly the Orientals, and among them especially Patricius of Tyana, immediately exclaimed: "It is unjust to condemn any one in his absence, and we agree with the decree of Tyre, and declare Ibas to be a rightful bishop." Others exclaimed: "We oppose," and "There are accusers of Ibas at the door; they ought to be heard." The commissioners gave order that these should be admitted, and they were the deacon Theophilus, with Euphrasius, Abraham, and Antiochus (whether laymen or clerics is not said). Theophilus requested that the Acts of Berytus should be read, and it would be seen from them that Ibas had been justly condemned. To the question of the commissioners, whether he had come forward personally as the accuser of Ibas or in the interest of orthodoxy, he answered: "To come forward as personal accuser would be dangerous for him as a deacon, and, besides, the witnesses were wanting to him for this purpose." To the further question, whether he could appeal to documents, he mentioned the minutes of Berytus and Ephesus (the Robber-Synod), and appealed, in reference to the latter, to Thalassius and Eusebius of Ancyra. But these two former leaders of the Robber-Synod could now only remember generally that many had then been deposed, but that they had taken no special active part in the matter.

The commissioners asked if Ibas had then been present, and when they were forced to say he was not, the cry again broke out: "That is unjust!" Theophilus replied: "The truth must (first) be ascertained by the Synod;" and Eustathius of Berytus now asserted that (at the investigation at Tyre, as is clear from what follows) three, six, and twelve witnesses had come forward, who declared that they had heard the scandalous expression of Ibas: "I do not envy Christ, that He has become God!" When required to make a statement in accordance with truth on this subject, Photius declared that "certainly priests and monks from Mesopotamia had charged Ibas with having used that expression, but he had denied it; and we (the judges) assumed the office of mediators, and bid these priests and monks leave Tyre, as the whole city took offence

at that assertion. Since Ibas then declared upon oath that he had said nothing of the kind, and that the witnesses who had come forward against him were friends and inmates of the houses of his accusers (and thus not free from suspicion), we reconciled the two parties, and they again entered into communion with one another."¹

The secretary Constantine now read the instructions which the Emperor Theodosius II. had imparted to his minister (the tribune and notary of the Prætorians) Damascius, who had been appointed to conduct the business at Berytus (see above, p. 179 f.), and then the Acts of the proceedings at Berytus.² According to these, Bishops Photius, Eustathius, and Uranius had met at Berytus on the 1st of September 448 or 449 (see above, p. 181), in the new episcopal residence of the new church, as judges of Ibas, in presence of the imperial tribune Damascius and the deacon Eulogius of Constantinople, as the deputy of Flavian. The accused were the Bishops Ibas of Edessa, John of Theodosiople, Daniel of Carræ (a nephew of Ibas); as accusers (and witnesses) were present the clerics Samuel, Cyrus, Eulogius, Maras, Ablavius, John, Anatolius, Caiumas, and Abibus. After the reading of the imperial instructions, which had been given to Damascius, and after Eulogius had remarked that the clerics named had already brought forward their complaints against the three bishops at Constantinople, Ibas was required by the judges to relate what had taken place in the Synod held also on his account under Domnus at Antioch (see above, p. 179). He stated that in Lent the four clerics excommunicated by him, Samuel, Cyrus, Maras, and Eulogius, had gone to Antioch to complain of him. As Easter (447 or 448) was near, Domnus for the time released them from the excommunication, but the decision of the dispute itself was put off to the largely-attended Synod which met after Easter at Antioch. At the same time, he had forbidden the four clerics of Edessa, under heavy penalties, again to leave Antioch until judgment should be pronounced. When the Synod began, the complaint of the four clerics had been read, but only two of them were

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 203-210; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 507-510.

² Mansi, t. vii. p. 210 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 510 sqq.

now present ; while the other two, Samuel and Cyrus, had fled from Antioch before Ibas arrived, and had gone to Constantinople. At the request of the judges a passage had been read at Berytus from the Antiochene Acts, in which the two accusers who still remained asserted that their colleagues had fled from fear of the malice of Ibas ; but Domnus replied that they had certainly had nothing to fear from Ibas, as the latter had left the whole matter in his hands ; they were manifestly fugitives, and had set at nought the excommunication with which they had been threatened, and had rendered themselves liable to the greater excommunication. This fragment of the Antiochene Acts was subscribed by Domnus and ten other bishops.¹

At Berytus was next read the paper of the four priests of Edessa, which had been handed in on the previous day, and they were then allowed to bring forward their points of complaint. They were :

1. Although the city had collected 1500 gold pieces for the redemption of prisoners, and although 6000 or somewhat more lay with the treasurer, without the revenues which his brother drew, yet Ibas had sold the silver vessels of the Church, in weight 200 pounds, and had handed over no more than 1000 gold pieces from the sale (for the redemption of the prisoners) ; the rest he had spent for himself.

2. A valuable chalice, set with precious stones, which, eleven years before, a holy man had presented to our Church, he had not put among the other vessels of the Church, and we know not what has become of it.

3. He takes money for ordinations.

4. He wished to consecrate as bishop of Bathene the deacon Abraham, who stood in union with a sorcerer, and deposed the archdeacon who opposed it. As, however, he could not force Abraham upon them as bishop, he made him *ξενοδόχος*. He has besides (from him) several charms in his hands, which he ought to have given over to judgment.

5. He consecrated as priest a certain Valentius, who was held to be an adulterer and pederastian, and punished those who offered opposition.

6. He made his brother's son, Daniel, bishop of a city

¹ Mañsi, t. vii. p. 215 sqq. ; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 514 sq.

(Carrae) where there are still many heathens, and where an able bishop was specially needed. Daniel, however, is an ill-regulated, luxurious young man, who, from love for a married woman, Challosa, very often resides in Antioch, often travels with her, and has improper intercourse with her.

7. All the ecclesiastical revenues, which are very great, he (Ibas) spends upon his brother and his relations. We request that he may give an account to you.

8. In the same way he acts with the estates of the Church, with the gifts in fruits, with the gold and silver crosses, and

9. With the money destined for the redemption of prisoners.

10. When the memory of the holy martyrs was celebrated, he provided only a small quantity of wine, and that bad and quite new, for the holy sacrifice, for consecration and the communion of the people, so that the servants of the Church were under the necessity of buying six pots of wine equally bad from a wineshop. Even this did not suffice, so that he (Ibas) made a sign to those who distributed the holy body (τὸ ἅγιον σῶμα) to go out (from the church into the sacristy, that is, to cease with the distribution of the holy bread), because there was no more blood (τοῦ αἵματος μὴ ἐύρισκομένον). They themselves, however (Ibas and his clergy), drank and always had choice wine. This took place before the eyes of the archdeacon, whose duty it was to make representations to the bishop. As he would not, we were under the necessity of doing so. Ibas, however, paid no attention to them, so that many were offended.

11. He is a Nestorian, and calls the holy Cyril a heretic.

12. Bishop Daniel has ordained several clergymen, profligate like himself.

13. When the priest Peirozos gave his property to the poor churches, Ibas was angry at this, and gave out that he had a transfer (security) from him for 3200 gold pieces, in order to hinder him from his purpose and to annoy him.

14. When Bishop Daniel made his will, and left his large property, which he had accumulated from the possession of the Church, to Challosa and her relations, Ibas said nothing.

15. Challosa, who before had nothing, now practises usury with the property of the Church.

16. A deacon named Abraham obtained a large property, and Daniel persuaded him to make it over to him, swearing that he would give it to the poor. This condition was even put in the deacon's will; but Daniel gave it to Challosa.

17. If the heathen, contrary to the existing prohibition, bring sacrifices, Daniel takes fees from them, and therefore will hear no complaints.

18. In a forest which belongs to the Church of Edessa, building wood was cut down and conveyed to Challosa.¹

The judges at Berytus wished that the accusers would confine themselves to the principal points, and these in the case of one in holy orders were whether he were (a) orthodox, (b) free from excesses, (c) did not give up religion for money. Responding to this demand, Maras brought forward as the first point of complaint, that "Ibas was heretical, for he had said: I do not envy Christ that He became God, for as far as He became this, I also have become the same." When interrogated on this, Ibas pronounced an anathema on every one who should dare to use such an expression, saying that he himself had certainly never used it, and that he would suffer himself to be put to death a thousand times rather than speak so. The second accuser, Samuel, then asserted that Ibas had said it even in the church, about three years ago, at Easter to the clergy, when, in accordance with the custom, he was handing them the festal presents. Of this there were three witnesses present—the deacons David, Maras, and Sabbas; but all the clergy had heard it, and therefore more witnesses could be procured. Ibas replied, that his whole clergy, about two hundred strong, had testified to his orthodoxy in a written memorial to Archbishop Domnus of Antioch and to the judges; this testimony of so many was certainly more weighty than that of those three, who, besides, had already appeared as his accusers at Constantinople, and consequently could no longer be regarded as impartial witnesses. The judges thought it just that not merely these three, but all the clergy of Edessa who might have heard the expression, should be received as witnesses, and it could only make an unfavourable impression when the accusers, although they themselves had referred to

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 222 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 518 sqq.

these many witnesses, now endeavoured to prevent their being received, under the pretext that the majority would not venture to come forward on account of the well-known violence of Ibas. He had even, they said, expelled those fifteen clerics who would not subscribe a memorial in his favour which was sent to Antioch. Ibas corrected this statement by saying that he had requested that those who had signed the accusation of Samuel, Cyrus, and others against him, should withdraw from his communion until the issue of the matter was determined, and thus these fifteen had excommunicated themselves. By him, however, no excommunication had been pronounced upon them.

The complainants contested this representation in so far as to assert that only two, not fifteen, had in that declaration voluntarily separated themselves from Ibas; the judges, however, turned to the principal point, and asked Ibas again whether he had made use of that expression in reference to Christ. He replied: "I did not say that, and I anathematize him who says it; not even from a demon have I ever heard such a thing." The accusers again appealed to their three witnesses and also to others, whom, however, they had not with them; and the examination now went on to the question whether Ibas had called S. Cyril a heretic? Ibas replied, "that he did not remember it, and if he had done so, it must have been at a time when the Synod of the Orientals (during the Œcumenical Council at Ephesus, and in the time following) had the same view. In this he had only followed his Exarch (John of Antioch). This, however, he had said, that if Cyril did not explain himself better respecting his twelve propositions, he would not acknowledge him." The judges then, with accurate precision, indicated the point of the accusation by asking whether Ibas, after the restoration of peace between Cyril and John of Antioch (see above, p. 136), had called the former a heretic.

Ibas was able to show that from this time he had been in communion with Cyril and Cyril with him; but his opponents maintained the reverse,¹ and professed to prove it from the

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 227-242; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 522-527. On the history of Ibas, cf. Jos. Simon. Assemani, *Biblioth. Clement. Vatic.* t. i. c. 15, pp. 199-204.

letter of Ibas to the Persian Maris which was now read in its chief contents. From this, however, it was clear only that Ibas even in that later time (after the union) maintained that Cyril had formerly taught propositions which were really Apollinarian, and only at the union had come to confess the right doctrine. This letter to Maris (Bishop of Hardaschir in Persia) runs, in its chief contents, as follows: "Since thy piety was here, a great controversy has broken out between Nestorius and Cyril, and they write angry books against each other which give offence. Nestorius asserted, for instance, that holy Mary is not the God-bearer, so that many regarded him as an adherent of Paul of Samosata, who declared Christ to be a mere man. Cyril, however, stumbled in the controversy against Nestorius, and fell into the theory of Apollinaris. He asserted, like him, that God the Logos Himself had become man, so that there was no difference between the temple and Him that dwelt in it. He wrote the twelve chapters (anathematisms), which thou knowest, maintaining that there was only one nature of the Godhead and manhood of our Lord Jesus Christ (Ibas here, like most of the Orientals, misunderstood Cyril's third anathematism), and that therefore we must not separate the expressions which our Lord uses in reference to Himself, and which the evangelists use respecting Him. These chapters are full of impiety, as thou knowest without my saying it. For how can one refer the expression 'the Word which was from the beginning' to the temple which was born of Mary? Or how can one understand the expression, 'Thou madest Him a little lower than the angels,' of the Godhead of the Only-begotten? The Church teaches from the beginning two natures—one power, one Person, which is the one Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. (Ibas was on the whole orthodox, but regarded the *communicatio idiomatum* as inadmissible.)—On account of that controversy the Emperors convoked the Synod of Ephesus; before, however, the whole of the bishops who had been summoned arrived there, Cyril, from hatred to Nestorius, knew how to captivate the eyes and ears of all those who were present as by a magical draught, and before John of Antioch came to the Synod they deposed Nestorius without

any previous examination (!). Two days after this deposition we arrived at Ephesus, and when we heard that they had there already confirmed the twelve chapters of Cyril, and had defined them to be the true doctrine (see p. 48, note 2), all the bishops of the East (*i.e.* of the Antiochene patriarchate) deposed Cyril and pronounced a sentence of excommunication against the rest of the bishops who had assented to his chapters. Upon this they all returned to their cities; but Nestorius could not return to Constantinople, because he was hated by the city and by the great ones who lived there (the Court certainly protected him!). The Anatolian Synod (that is, the Oriental bishops) remained now separate from the adherents of Cyril, and there arose a great schism, so that heathens and heretics mocked. No one ventured to go from one city to another, from one neighbourhood to another; every one persecuted his neighbour as an enemy, and many, under the pretext of ecclesiastical zeal, gratified their private enmities. One of these is the tyrant of our city, who is well known to thee (Bishop Rabulas of Edessa, the predecessor of Ibas), who, under the pretext of religion, persecutes not only the living but the dead, as, *e.g.*, the blessed Theodore (of Mop-suestia), that herald of the truth and teacher of the Church, who not only smote heretics during his life, but also after his death left in his writings spiritual weapons for the children of the Church. Him he ventured to anathematize publicly before the whole Church, and there arose everywhere a great inquiry respecting his books, not because they were opposed to the faith, for as long as Theodore lived Rabulas praised him and read his books, but from an enmity against Theodore hitherto concealed, because he had once publicly opposed him at the Synod. In such a sad state of things God awakened the mind of the Emperor, so that he sent a high official of the palace and compelled the most holy Archbishop John of Antioch to be reconciled with Cyril. And John sent Bishop Paul of Emesa with a letter to Cyril, in which the true faith was explained, and gave him a commission to the effect that, if Cyril should agree to this faith, and should anathematize those who say, 'the Godhead suffered,' and 'the Godhead and the manhood are only one nature,' he should enter into communion with

him. And God softened the heart of the Egyptian, so that without difficulty he assented to this declaration of faith, and accepted it, and anathematized all who believed otherwise. And they entered into communion with each other, the controversy ceased, and peace returned to the Church. The letters interchanged between John and Cyril I have sent thee that thou mayest see and make known to all that the strife has ceased and the partition wall is taken away, and those are put to shame who persecuted the living and the dead. Now they are obliged to confess their own faults and teach the reverse of their previous assertions. For now, no one ventures any longer to say that the Godhead and the manhood are only one nature, but they agree together in faith in the temple (manhood of Christ) and Him who dwells therein as the one Son, Jesus Christ."¹

With this the Acts of Berytus ended. On the further points of complaint there seems to have been no more done; but soon afterwards at Tyre a reconciliation between the two parties seems to have been arrived at. After, however, the Acts of Berytus were now read at Chalcedon, Ibas requested the imperial commissioners² that the letter sent in his favour to Berytus by the clergy of Edessa should now be communicated, and it was immediately read by the secretary Beronicianus. Addressed to Photius of Tyre and Eustathius of Berytus, the memorial declares it to be utterly untrue that Ibas had used that blasphemous expression concerning Christ in the presence of the subscribers. The clergy declared upon oath that they never heard such words from him, and that, if they had heard it, they would not have remained another moment in his communion. The judges should therefore exhort Ibas to return as soon as possible to his flock, particularly as his presence was necessary at the approaching Easter on account of the catechizing and the baptisms. Thirteen priests, thirty-seven deacons, and twelve sub-deacons and lectors had subscribed.³

The deacon Theophilus, who appeared at Chalcedon as accuser, made an objection to this memorial which was not

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 242-247; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 527; Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 480 ff.

² Mansi, t. vii. p. 250, and Hardouin, t. ii. p. 531, have not remarked that this again belongs to the Synod of Chalcedon.

³ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 250-255; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 531-538.

quite intelligible. Without attending to it, the imperial commissioners now wished to have the Acts of the Robber-Synod in regard to Ibas read. The papal legates wished, however, that an assembly so unjust should not be called a Synod, and that nothing should be read from it, since the apostolic Bishop of Rome had rejected all its decrees, with the exception of the elevation of Maximus to the see of Antioch. All the other bishops agreed to this.

The reading therefore did not take place, and the commissioners asked: "What does the holy Synod decree concerning Ibas?" The legates declared: "After the reading of the documents, we learnt from the sentence of the venerable bishops that Ibas was declared innocent. From the reading of his letter we have seen that he is orthodox. Therefore our judgment is that he be restored to his episcopal dignity and to the church, of which he was unlawfully and in his absence deprived. In regard, however, to the Bishop (Nonnus) who was recently appointed in his place, the Bishop of Antioch shall decide." Anatolius of Constantinople said: "The honesty of the bishops who previously pronounced judgment respecting Ibas, and the reading of the earlier Acts, show that the charges brought against Ibas are untrue. Therefore I dismiss all suspicion respecting him, since he receives and subscribes the definition of the faith recently given by the Synod and the letter of Leo; and I regard him as worthy of the bishopric." As third voter, Maximus of Antioch declared: "From that which has just been read it is clear that Ibas is innocent on all the points which have been brought against him, and the orthodoxy of his opinions is proved by the reading of the copy of his letter brought forward by his opponent; therefore I also vote that he again receive his episcopal dignity and his city. . . . Nonnus, however, shall retain the episcopal dignity (not office) until I have decided respecting him with the bishops of the diocese" (he was subsequently the successor of Ibas). All the other members also voted for the reinstatement of Ibas, several under the express condition that he should now anathematize Nestorius and his heresy; on the letter to Maris *in specie*, however, the Synod gave no judgment. After the voting was

completed, Ibas, as requested, fulfilled the condition which had been laid down, in the words: "I previously anathematized Nestorius and his doctrine in writing (in the document of union, see p. 134 f.), and I now anathematize him ten thousand times. Anathema to Nestorius and Eutyches, and to every Monophysite; and I anathematize every one who does not think as this holy Synod thinks."¹

In the same tenth session, Maximus of Antioch requested that out of compassion the Synod should allow the deposed Domnus, his predecessor in the see of Antioch, some support from the property of the Church. The Roman legates and Anatolius, Juvenal, and all the rest, commended this goodwill of Maximus, and on the question being put by the commissioners, the Synod approved of this proposal, and left the settlement of the amount to be given to the judgment of Maximus himself.² This subject, however, as we shall see, came up again for discussion on the 31st of October.

SEC. 197. *Eleventh Session, October 29, 451.*

The eleventh session, on the 29th of October, had for its subject the complaint of Bassianus, formerly bishop of Ephesus.³ He had appealed, and presented a petition to the

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 255-270; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 533-543.

² Mansi, t. vii. p. 270 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 543. The genuineness of the document which refers to Domnus, which is now extant only in Latin, is contested by Quesnel and Natalis Alexander. It is, however, maintained by Tillemont, Baluze (in Mansi, t. vii. p. 665 sqq., n. xxxii.-lvi.), and especially by the brothers Ballerini (S. Leonis *Opp.* t. ii. p. 1215 sq. and p. 1234 sq.), who discovered in a Vatican codex a still more ancient Latin translation of this document (older even than that of Rusticus), and had it printed (*l.c.* p. 1226 and p. 1234, n. 11). In this newly discovered copy, the proceedings with respect to Domnus are rightly placed after those respecting the agreement with Juvenal (Sessio vii.); whilst in the Greek codex, from which Rusticus made his translation, the proceedings respecting Domnus were erroneously placed before those others (Rusticus himself says this, in Mansi, t. vii. p. 734: *Post hæc sequitur* etc.). The latter took place vii. Kal. Nov. (= Oct. 26), those on Domnus on the following day, vi. Kal. Nov. (= Oct. 27), and it is clear, finally, from the chronological indication, vi. Kal. Nov., that if the Greek copies give the date of the tenth session correctly (Oct. 28, see above, p. 359), the transactions respecting Domnus must be referred to the ninth session.

³ The Acts of this session are in Mansi, t. vii. pp. 271-294; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 546-558. German abridgment in Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 486 ff.

Emperor, and the latter had directed him to the Synod. The short letter was first read, which the Emperor (in legal style, the two Emperors) addressed to the Synod, recommending a speedy settlement of the matter, and then the memorial which Bassianus had presented to the Emperor. He complains in it that certain priests and laymen had suddenly, in a most uncanonical and cruel manner, torn him out of the church, after Divine service, beaten him, dragged him into the forum, imprisoned him for some time, threatened him with the sword, robbed him of his episcopal mantle, taken away his property and shared it among them, had killed several of his people, and had placed one of their number (Stephen) in his episcopal see. He now prayed that, as he was quite innocent, the Emperor would have the matter examined by the Synod, and would protect him, until a judgment was pronounced, against the plots of his enemies, and see to the completion of the desired sentence.¹

To the question of the imperial commissioners, who they were who had ill-treated him, Bassian replied, naming first of all Stephen, the present bishop of Ephesus. Asked by the commissioners for an explanation, Stephen asserted that Bassian had not even been ordained at Ephesus, but had, at the time of the vacancy in the see, with the assistance of an armed mob, thrust himself in, and taken possession of the bishopric. He had therefore been rightly expelled from it, and forty Asiatic bishops had, with the consent of the assembled clergy and people of Ephesus, consecrated him (Stephen) as bishop, who had for fifty years been one of the clergy of Ephesus. Bassian replied that he was made bishop in a canonical manner, that he had from his youth supported the poor, and had built a hospital and poorhouse with seventy beds. On account of the popularity which he had thus gained, the Bishop (of Ephesus) at that time, Memnon, had hated him, and, in order to remove him from the place, had by force consecrated him Bishop of Evazæ. He had struggled, but Memnon had used force, so that blood had been shed before the altar. To Evazæ, however, he had never gone, and after the death of Memnon, which soon followed, his successor

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 274 sq. ; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 547.

(Basil) had acknowledged the violence, had consecrated another bishop for Evazæ, but had left him in the episcopal dignity, and had held communion with him. After the death of Basil he had been forcibly placed upon the episcopal chair by the clergy and people of Ephesus, as Bishop Olympius could testify, who was present in Ephesus at the time, and was now present at the Synod. The Emperor had twice confirmed him, the second time by the Silentiar Eustathius; and all the bishops, even Proclus of Constantinople, had acknowledged him. So he had been for four years in the bishopric, and had consecrated ten bishops and many clerics. On the very last day on which he held office, he had received a very gracious letter from the Emperor through the Silentiar; but the next day, after holding divine service, he had been suddenly ill-treated in the manner which he had described, and had been expelled.

In reply, Stephen appealed to many of the bishops present, who could testify that Bassian had thrust himself into the bishopric by force, and therefore had been declared to be deposed by Pope Leo, by Flavian of Constantinople, and by the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. So the Emperor Theodosius II. and the whole Synod of the Orientals had recognized what had been done (his expulsion and the elevation of Stephen). The Silentiar Eustathius had been sent to Ephesus by the Emperor Theodosius on purpose to inquire into the existing dissension between Bassian, the clergy, and the poor, whom he had wronged. He had spent three months in this inquiry at Ephesus, and had made known his sentence. Every one knew what it was.

In order to defend his elevation to the see of Ephesus, Bassian laid peculiar stress upon the fact that he had never really been Bishop of Evazæ, and therefore that he had not uncanonically removed to another bishopric; and, in order to gain a starting-point for the consideration of the matter, the imperial commissioners ordered to be read two older canons, the 16th and 17th of the Synod of Antioch, of the year 341, which, in the collection of canons then in use, had the numbers 95 and 96. The first says: "If a bishop without a see forces himself into a vacant bishopric,

and takes possession of the see without a complete Synod, he shall be deposed, even if he has been elected by the whole diocese into which he has intruded. A complete Synod is one at which the Metropolitan is present." The other canon says: "If a bishop has received consecration, and has been appointed to preside over a diocese, but does not accept the office nor allow himself to be persuaded to set out for the church appointed to him, he shall be excommunicated until he is induced to undertake the office, or until the complete Synod of the bishops of the Eparchy has come to a decision concerning him."¹

To the question of the imperial commissioners as to who had ordained him, Bassian could name only Bishop Olympius of Theodosiopolis, who was present; he no longer remembered the others. Olympius then stated that, after the death of Bishop Basil of Ephesus, the clergy of that city had requested him to come and proceed to a new ordination. In the belief that several bishops would appear, he had gone, and had waited three days for their arrival. When none appeared, the clergy of Ephesus had come to him again, in order to take counsel as to what should be done; the house was suddenly besieged by a great crowd of people, and they had taken him by force into the church, a certain Olosericus having even drawn a sword, and pushed him along with Bassian on to the episcopal throne. In this way the enthronization had taken place. Bassian exclaimed: "You lie!" The commissioners, however, next wished to be assured as to whether the late Bishop Proclus of Constantinople had actually acknowledged Bassian. They therefore asked the clergy of Constantinople who were present, and they testified to the fact, adding that Proclus had introduced the name of Bassian into the diptychs of his church, on which, until lately, it still remained.

The commissioners further requested Bishop Stephen to tell what he knew of the deposition of Bassian, and whether he had himself been ordained by a Synod. Stephen appealed to a letter of the Bishop of Alexandria, who had been commissioned by the Emperor Theodosius to write to Ephesus, and to a letter of Leo's, which could both be placed before them (they no longer exist). The notaries, too, could present

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 282 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 551.

the documents relating to the way and manner of his ordination. Bassian, however, argued against Stephen thus: "The bishops who consecrated him were consecrated by me. If I then, as he maintains, was not a legitimate bishop, then he is not legitimately ordained. If, however, he maintains the validity of his ordination, then he must also acknowledge that I am a true bishop."¹

Upon this Cassian, a presbyter, whom Bassian had brought with him, came forward with his connected complaint. In the middle of a week Stephen and Maconius had taken him into the baptistry, and had made him swear upon the Gospels that he would forsake Bassian. At first, out of reverence for every kind of oath, he had been unwilling to swear, but they had at last induced him to do so. Soon afterwards, on the fifth day of Easter, they had imprisoned Bishop Bassian, and at the same time had ill-treated him (Cassian). In order, however, not to break his oath, he had since then, for the space of four years, gone about begging in Constantinople (with Bassian). The representations of Bassian and of Cassian had made an impression, and now Bishop Lucian of Byzantium and Meliphthongus of Heliopolis came forward and declared, in the name of many of their colleagues, that "a man who, like Bassian, had been without opposition bishop for four years, and acknowledged by Proclus, and had been in church communion with Stephen himself and others, should not have been deposed by mere violence, and without formal judgment."

Once more Stephen appealed to Pope Leo, who had recognized the deposition of Bassian; but Cecropius of Sebastopolis and many bishops and the clergy of Constantinople exclaimed, that "now Flavian, although already dead, revenged himself on him" (Stephen had been among the leaders of the Robber-Synod), and the imperial commissioners gave their judgment that, in their opinion, neither Bassian nor Stephen was to be acknowledged as legitimate bishop of Ephesus, and that a new one must be elected; but they would leave the whole decision to the Synod. The bishops first agreed by general acclamation to this proposal, and, in particular, the papal legates, together with Anatolius of Constantinople and Eusebius of

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 283-287; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 551-554.

Dorylaeum, declared for it. But the Asiatic bishops (*i.e.* of the exarchate of Ephesus) threw themselves on their knees before the Synod, and asked for mercy, since great disturbances would arise in Ephesus if a successor should here (at the Synod) be given to Bassian; their exarch must be ordained in Ephesus itself. All the twenty-seven bishops who, since Timothy (the disciple of Paul), had occupied this episcopal chair, had been consecrated at Ephesus, with one single exception, that of Basil, and this had occasioned much bloodshed.

The clergy of Constantinople, on the other hand, wished to maintain that the right to consecrate a bishop for Ephesus belonged to their archbishop, and that the decrees of the 150 fathers (of the second Ecumenical Synod) must be observed.¹ Besides, as a matter of fact, several bishops of Ephesus had been consecrated at Constantinople, or by the Archbishop of Constantinople, or with his consent, as Memnon by John Chrysostom, and Castinus by Heraclides. In particular, Proclus of Constantinople had consecrated Basil of Ephesus, and the Emperor Theodosius II. and Cyril of Alexandria had co-operated.

We see that the question here arose as to whether the exarchate of Ephesus was subject to the patriarchate of Constantinople or not; and as controversy on this subject was threatening to break out, the commissioners thought it well to postpone the decision of the question, whether a new bishop should be elected for Ephesus, to the next session.²

SEC. 198. *Twelfth and Thirteenth Sessions, October 30, 451.*

The twelfth session was solemnized on the following day, October 30,³ and, first, the three imperial commissioners complained that they were so long detained by the Synod from their civil duties. The Synod should therefore quickly decide whether a new bishop should be appointed for Ephesus, or Bassian or Stephen should be retained.—Anatolius of Con-

¹ They evidently misunderstood the 2d and 3d canons of Constantinople. Cf. vol. ii. p. 355 ff. But the Council of Chalcedon agreed with them in the main point, as we see from its 28th canon.

² Mansi, t. vii. pp. 287-294; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 554-558.

³ Its Acts are in Mansi, t. vii. pp. 294-300; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 559-563.

stantinople and the legate Paschasinus expressed themselves decidedly in favour of the election of a new bishop, but they thought that maintenance should be provided for the two others from the property of the Church. Julian of Cos, on the other hand, thought that both should not be deposed; but the legate Lucentius did not give any distinct expression of opinion, merely stating, what was in fact self-evident, that both could not at the same time hold the bishopric. As the other bishops held back with their votes, the imperial commissioners had the book of the holy Gospels brought, and requested from all a conscientious answer to the question, whether one of the two, Bassian or Stephen, or neither, was worthy of the bishopric.—Again, Anatolius answered first, and expressed himself in favour of a new election, adding words which gratified the Asiatics: “The new shepherd of Ephesus should be chosen by those whom he has to watch over.” After him Paschasinus, Juvenal, and some other bishops also gave their voices for a new election. Maximus of Antioch, on the contrary, Julian of Cos, and others, wished to leave it to the bishops of the eparchy of Ephesus to decide whether one of the two was worthy of the see. A third party did not express themselves clearly and definitely. The commissioners therefore now brought to the vote the question put into definite form: “Shall a new bishop be appointed for Ephesus, in accordance with the proposal of Anatolius and Paschasinus, while the two others are allowed to retain the episcopal dignity and to have maintenance from the property of the Church of Ephesus?” This was received with acclamation, and announced by the commissioners as a synodal decree, with the addition, that each of the two deposed bishops should annually receive 200 gold pieces. This also was universally received by acclamation, and it was finally decreed that whatever Bassian could legally prove to have been taken from his property should be restored to him again.¹

On the same 30th of October the thirteenth session was held.² Archbishop Eunomius of Nicomedia had appealed to

¹ Mansi and Hardouin, *l.c.*

² The Acts are in Mansi, t. vii. pp. 302-314; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 563-571. Abridgment in Fuchs, *l.c.* S. 493.

the Emperor, and petitioned for protection and for the restoration of the privileges of his see, which had been forcibly violated by Bishop Anastasius of Nicæa, in opposition to all previous custom; and the Emperor had made over the decision of the question to the Synod. Eunomius therefore now brought his petition before this high assembly, and after his petition to the Emperor had been read, the commissioners requested an explanation from Anastasius. He, on his side, not only denied that he had been guilty of any offence, but asserted, on the contrary, that the Bishop of Nicomedia had made encroachments on *his* diocese. Eunomius was therefore required to give details, and said: "According to ancient custom, I have under me the churches which lie in the eparchy of Bithynia, but Anastasius has excommunicated clerics of Basilinopolis who are subject to me, a thing which is forbidden by the canons."

Anastasius replied that, on the contrary, Basilinopolis belonged to the Church of Nicæa, for it had previously been a village belonging to Nicæa, and when it had been raised to the position of a city by the Emperor Julian or another, he had removed men of business thither from Nicæa. This state of things still continued, and men of business, as necessity arose, were constantly removed backwards and forwards from one town to the other. Since Basilinopolis had become a city, the Bishop of Nicæa had also taken part in the consecrations there. He could bring forward a letter of the sainted Bishop John (Chrysostom) of Constantinople to the Bishop of Nicæa, in which the latter was exhorted to go to Basilinopolis and there to regulate the Church. He could also prove how many (clerics and bishops of Basilinopolis) had been ordained from Nicæa.

Eunomius replied: "If that ever took place, it was improperly done, and this cannot prejudice my rights; besides, I can prove that many more ordinations at Basilinopolis have proceeded from Nicomedia than from Nicæa, from which city probably only one ordination had taken place, and that either surreptitiously or during a vacancy in the see of Nicomedia." —From further statements and replies it came out that both parties had previously appealed to the Archbishop of Constan-

tinople for a settlement of the dispute, and further, that Eunomius of Nicomedia had cited the bishop of Basilinopolis to answer to an accusation brought by the clergy of that city, but that he had fled to Nicæa, that he might receive the protection of Anastasius.

As before, so here again, the commissioners, in order to lead to a settlement of the case, caused an ancient canon, to be read, namely, the fourth of Nicæa, which had previously been recited at the close of the fourth session (see above, p. 341 f.). If the superscription in the present Acts were correct, it would have stood as No. 6 in the collection of canons used at Chalcedon; as, however, all the old collections begin with the canons of Nicæa, it is not improbable that No. 4 should be read instead of No. 6. It runs: "The bishop shall be appointed by all the bishops of the eparchy; if, however, that is difficult on account of pressing necessity, or on account of the length of journeys, three bishops at the least shall meet and proceed to the imposition of hands, with the written consent of those who are absent. The confirmation and supervision of what is done belongs in each eparchy to the Metropolitan."¹ Anastasius of Nicæa remarked that this canon spoke in favour of him, for he was certainly Metropolitan, in proof of which he had a decree of the Emperors Valentinian I. and Valens read, in which the title of metropolis, which had been previously assigned to the city of Nicæa, was confirmed, and the same privileges were conceded to it which were possessed by Nicomedia.—On the other hand, Eunomius appealed to a later decree of Valentinian, in which it was expressly said that the new honour which had been conferred upon the city of Nicæa could in no way interfere with the rights of Nicomedia, but, on the contrary, it was only a greater honour for Nicomedia itself, when the city which stood next after it bore the title of metropolis. The imperial commissioners remarked quite correctly that in both decrees there was nothing said of the bishoprics, but only of the civil honours of the two cities. But according to the canons of the Church there could be but one ecclesiastical metropolis in each province. The Synod then asserted definitely that Nicomedia was the ecclesiastical

¹ See vol. i. p. 381.

metropolis of Bithynia, and that the bishop of Nicomedia had to consecrate all the bishops of the province. The Bishop of Nicæa had only this superiority (on account of the civil rank of his city), that he had precedence over all the other suffragans.

After this judgment was pronounced, Archdeacon Aetius of Constantinople requested that no prejudice should hence arise to the rights of the Archbishop of Constantinople, since it could be proved that he was authorized either to consecrate at Basilinopolis or to give permission for consecration. The Synod, however, refused then to declare that the patriarchal rights of Constantinople extended over Bithynia, but simply exclaimed: "The canons must remain in force;" and the imperial commissioners cut short all hesitation by the remark, that the right of the Church of Constantinople to ordain in the provinces should be examined at its proper time by the Synod, and in fact the 28th canon was made to contain a remarkable regulation on this subject. At the close, Eunomius of Nicomedia offered thanks for the just judgment which had been pronounced, and gave the assurance that he honoured the Archbishop of Constantinople in accordance with the canons.¹

SEC. 199. *Fourteenth Session, October 31, 451, and its two continuations.*

On the following day, at the fourteenth session,² Bishop Sabinian of Perrha presented a petition addressed to the Emperors, and one to the Synod, representing that he had been unlawfully removed from his bishopric, and that he prayed for an inquiry. From his youth up he had been in a convent, and had not thought of a bishopric. But suddenly the Metropolitan of the province (Stephen of Hierapolis, as is clear

¹ Mansi and Hardouin, *ll. cc.*

² The Acts are in Mansi, t. vii. pp. 314-358; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 571-598. German abridgment in Fuchs, *l. c.* S. 496 ff. In the list of those present, Stephen of Ephesus is still mentioned (Mansi, *l. c.* p. 315; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 571), although he had in the 12th session been declared to have lost his claim on the see of Ephesus. As, however, he retained the episcopal dignity, he might still continue to be a member of the Synod.

from what follows), together with the comprovincial bishops, had come to him and had consecrated him bishop of Perrha in the place of Athanasius, who had been deposed by a Synod at Antioch, A.D. 445.¹ At the Robber-Synod, however, Athanasius had been reinstated by command of Dioscurus, while he had been expelled, to the great sorrow of the city.

The three imperial commissioners who have been mentioned requested Athanasius of Perrha, who was also present, to give an explanation on this subject, and he appealed first of all to letters of S. Cyril of Alexandria and Proclus of Constantinople, who had interceded for him with Domnus of Antioch. After the death of Cyril, Domnus, taking advantage of the moment, cited him before his Synod, and he had promised to attend if Domnus and the Synod would not go beyond the opinion of the two archbishops (Cyril and Proclus). He now requested that the letters of these two archbishops should be read. The first of them, that from Cyril to Domnus, complains that some clerics of Perrha had behaved in a very insubordinate manner towards their Bishop Athanasius, as he asserted that they had banished and deposed him, had arbitrarily appointed other stewards,² and had struck his name out of the diptychs. As Perrha was somewhat remote from Antioch, Archbishop Domnus was requested to send commissioners thither to inquire into the matter, and to bring those accused by Athanasius to account, and, in case they were guilty, to depose them. Besides this, Athanasius had complained of the partiality of his present Metropolitan (Panoblius of Hierapolis).³ The same was set forth also in the much more copious letter which the deceased Patriarch Proclus of Constantinople had written to Domnus on this matter, and it was clear from both letters that Cyril and Proclus had expressed themselves in no way so favourably on behalf of Athanasius as he represented,

¹ On the history of this deposition and its grounds, particularly the stealing of the property of the Church, see above, p. 174.

² [See s.v. "Economus," in *Dicty. of Chr. Antiquities*.]

³ Panoblius was succeeded by John, and the latter by Stephen, in the metropolitan see of Hierapolis. Under Panoblius, Athanasius was driven away by his clergy; under John, he was deposed at the Antiochene Synod; and under Stephen, and by him, Sabinian had been appointed bishop of Perrha.

although they were inclined to attribute the greater injustice to the side of his opponents.

The imperial commissioners then caused to be read the minutes of the Antiochene Synod in question of A.D. 445, which, as we know, had deposed Athanasius, because, in spite of several citations, he had not vindicated himself from the charges which were brought against him, and had never appeared for examination, and had requested the Metropolitan John of Heliopolis to appoint a new bishop for Perrha.¹

After the reading of these extensive Acts, those seven bishops who had been present at this Antiochene Synod, and were now also members of the Council of Chalcedon, were obliged, at the request of the imperial commissioners, to relate what had passed, and they all laid chief stress upon the fact that Athanasius, in spite of all the citations, had not appeared. In excuse for himself he could only plead that Domnus, who was then Archbishop of Antioch, had been unfavourable to him; and on the proposal of the commissioners it was now decreed that, in the meantime, Sabinian should remain in possession of the see of Perrha, but that within eight months the Archbishop of Antioch should, with his council, examine whether the serious accusations brought against Athanasius were well-founded or not. If they were well-founded, then he must not only be removed from the bishopric, but handed over to the secular tribunal. If, however, no inquiry should be instituted against him within the period stated, or he should not be found guilty, then he should be reinstated in the bishopric of Perrha by Maximus of Antioch, but a maintenance should be allowed to Sabinian from the property of the Church there, the amount of which should be determined by Maximus of Antioch, in proportion to the value of the property of the Church of Perrha.²

On the same 31st of October a further session was held, the minutes of which are given by the Ballerini alone, from Greek manuscripts in the library of S. Mark's at Venice.³ In accordance with the manner in which these Venetian manu-

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 326-354; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 579-595; cf. above, p. 174.

² Mansi, t. vii. p. 358; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 598; Walch (*Ketzerhist.* Bd. vi. S. 384) has given wrongly the decree of this session.

³ In their edition of the works of Leo the Great, t. i. p. 1490 sq.

scripts reckon the sessions of Chalcedon, they had given the number 16 to the session which is now to be spoken of. But the Ballerini have properly remarked (*l.c.* p. 1491) that it ought to be placed *immediately* after the session which is noted as No. 14 in the usual collections. We reckon it therefore as only a division or continuation of the fourteenth session, while Mansi has erroneously, and apparently by an oversight, regarded it as a part of the very last or sixteenth session (according to the ordinary reckoning).¹

The contents of these newly-discovered minutes are, that now the papal legates, especially Julian of Cos, handed in to the Synod a letter from Leo, his 93d epistle, in the Latin original and in a Greek translation, and that the imperial commissioners approved, and ordered that it should immediately be read. This is the letter which Pope Leo had, on the 26th of June 451, addressed to the Synod which at first, as we know, had been summoned to Nicæa, and the contents of which have already been given at p. 280. Why this letter came so late before the Synod, after its contents were no longer of importance for the proceedings, is unknown.

The Ballerini, too, and Mansi as well, by means of a newly-discovered document (in a Latin translation),² have given us information respecting a third session which took place on the same day (October 31). Archbishop Maximus of Antioch, it is said, [*pri*]die Kal. Nov., again brought forward for consideration his two matters which had been before discussed in the seventh and tenth sessions (see above, pp. 355 and 370), namely, (*a*) the cession of the three ecclesiastical provinces of Palestine to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and (*b*) the agreement with his predecessor Domnus; and now, at his suggestion, it was confirmed by the Synod, and particularly by the papal legates, that (*a*) the two Phœnicias and Arabia should again be united to Antioch, while the three provinces of Palestine should belong to Jerusalem; and (*b*) that Domnus should henceforth live only in the *communio laicalis*, but should annually receive 250 solidi.

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 454; Hardouin was not acquainted with this document.

² Printed in the Ballerini's ed. of the works of Leo the Great, t. ii. pp. 1227, 1235, and in Mansi, t. vii. p. 722 C.

The fact that the very ancient Vatican manuscript (No. 1322) contains this very document, and also the other two referring to Maximus of Antioch, namely, the two earlier transactions concerning Domnus, and respecting the agreement with Jerusalem, is explained by the Ballerini (*l.c.* p. 1230 sq.) very satisfactorily by the consideration that Maximus, when he began to regret the agreement with Jerusalem, had at a very early period sent these three documents by themselves in a Latin translation to Rome, in the hope of bringing about the annulling of that agreement. In fact, too, Pope Leo, in the answer which he sent back to Maximus, declared that which had been done in this respect at Chalcedon as void because contrary to the 6th canon of Nicaea, and the assent of his legates as invalid. In spite of this, Jerusalem remained in possession of the three ecclesiastical provinces of Palestine.¹

SEC. 200. *Fifteenth Session. The Canons.*

From the minutes of the sixteenth session we learn that the imperial commissioners and the papal legates departed at the close of the fourteenth session, and that the other members of the Synod, on the same 31st of October, in a new discussion, which is reckoned as the fifteenth session, drew up the 28th canon of Chalcedon, and in this canon assigned to the Bishop of Constantinople a great patriarchal province, equal rights with the Roman see, and a rank next to that.² According to the testimony of Archdeacon Liberatus of Carthage and the Roman deacon Rusticus, who, on account of the controversy of the three chapters, both occupied themselves *ex professo*, in the sixth century, with the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, the whole of the canons of Chalcedon, and not merely the 28th, were drawn up in this fifteenth session (Liberatus calls it, according to his manner of reckoning, the eleventh).³ With

¹ Cf. Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* t. iii. p. 113 sqq.; Wiltseh, *Kirchl. Geographie und Statistik*, 1846, Bd. i. S. 207.

² We see this from the discourse which the papal legate Paschasius delivered at the beginning of the sixteenth session, Mansi, t. vii. p. 426; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 626.

³ *Liberati Breviarium causæ Nestorianorum et Eutych.* in Galland. *Biblioth. PP.* t. xii. p. 141 (see above, p. 285, note), and Rustici *Emendatio Antiqua*

this, too, agree those manuscripts of the Greek Acts which were made the basis of the work when the collections of Councils, and first the Roman collection, were drawn up (see vol. i. p. 69 ff.), and therefore all the canons of Chalcedon are universally ascribed to the fifteenth session. That this is in fact the more accurate view, Van Espen has attempted to prove on various grounds;¹ while before him the learned Baluze,² and more recently the celebrated brothers Ballerini,³ resting principally upon the authority of Evagrius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 18), maintained that, after the Emperor Marcian had, as we saw, proposed these canons, in the sixth session, the Synod immediately afterwards had drawn up, in its seventh session, a series of canons, including the three of the Emperor, while in the fifteenth session only the 28th and last genuine canon was brought forward by the Orientals, and in the absence of the papal legates gave occasion for a new session of the Synod, the sixteenth and last.

An unhesitating decision on this point is impossible so long as no new documents are discovered. It remains, however, most natural to assume that our Synod followed that which, as far as we know, was the usual practice in all the old Councils, and passed all the canons at one session. If the papal legates foresaw that among the canons to be put forth, the 28th would be one, and after the statement made by Archdeacon Aetius of Constantinople, at the sixteenth session, on the whole proceedings (see below, § 201), they could not help foreseeing it, it was natural that they should withdraw at the beginning of this discussion, notwithstanding the petitions of many (as appears from the Acts of the sixteenth session), in order to induce the Synod to omit this canon, and to preserve their own freedom of action. It is somewhat more difficult to explain the absence of the imperial commissioners, parti-

versionis Actorum Concilii Chalcedon, in Mansi, t. vii. p. 654 sqq., especially p. 738; cf. above, p. 291 f.

¹ *Commentarius in canones et decreta juris veteris etc.* Colon. Agripp. 1755, p. 231 sq.

² *Baluzii Prefatio*, in Mansi, t. vii. p. 658 sq.

³ In their ed. of the works of Leo the Great, t. ii. p. 503, note, and p. 514, note 30. They have on their side the letter of Pope Pelagius II. in Mansi, t. ix, p. 448 sq.; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 434 sq.

cularly as they had themselves requested the Synod to take in hand the discussion of the privileges of the see of Constantinople (see below, § 201), and their master, the Emperor, expressly wished the nature of these privileges to be settled (see below, § 203). But prudential considerations appear also to have prevented them from taking part in the drawing up of the important canon. If they foresaw that the Roman legates would protest against them, and if they were afterwards to take the place of *judices*, they could not from the beginning formally belong to one of the parties. If, however, they did not wish to be present at the passing of the 28th canon, it was necessary that they, like the legates, should withdraw at the beginning.

Certainly it may be objected that the papal legate Paschasius, in his speech at the beginning of the sixteenth session, made no distinction between good and bad regulations, which had been drawn up in his absence, but speaks as though the matter contained in the 28th canon had alone been then considered. But this, too, may be explained, when it is considered that Paschasius laid hold only of that point, and brought it forward on account of its great importance, and its, to him, objectionable character.

As to the number of canons put forth by the Synod of Chalcedon, for the present we permit ourselves only the short remark that the 28th is the last genuine one. Many manuscripts, however, contain only 27, others 30, a difference which we shall be able to explain later on, after we have considered the individual canons. These canons are:¹—

CAN. 1.

Τοὺς παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων καθ' ἐκάστην Σύνοδον ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν ἐκτεθέντας κανόνας κρατεῖν ἐδικαιώσαμεν.

“The canons hitherto put forth by the holy fathers in all the Synods shall have validity.”

Before the holding of the Council of Chalcedon, in the Greek Church, the canons of several Synods, which were held previously to that of Nicæa, were gathered into one collection

¹ They are found in Mansi, t. vii. p. 358; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 602 sqq.; Bruns, *Bibliotheca Eccles.* i. 1, p. 25 sqq.

and provided with continuous numbers (cf. vol. i. p. 367); and such a collection of canons, as we have seen (pp. 337, 372, and 378), lay before the Synod of Chalcedon.¹ As, however, the most of the Synods whose canons were received into the collection, *e.g.* those of Neo-Cæsarea, Ancyra, Gangra, Antioch, were certainly not Œcumenical Councils, and were even to some extent of doubtful authority, such as the Antiochene Synod of 341, the confirmation of the Œcumenical Synod was now given to them, in order to raise them to the position of universally and unconditionally valid ecclesiastical rules. It is admirably remarked by the Emperor Justinian, in his 131st Novel, c. i.: "We honour the doctrinal decrees of the first four Councils as we do Holy Scripture, but the canons given or *approved* by them as we do the laws." The *Corpus jur. can.* received this canon into c. 14, C. xxv. q. 1.²

CAN. 2.

Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ χρήμασι χειροτονίαν ποιήσαιο, καὶ εἰς πρῶσιν καταγάγῃ τὴν ἄπρατον χάριν, καὶ χειροτονήσῃ ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἐπίσκοπον ἢ χωρεπίσκοπον ἢ πρεσβύτερον ἢ διάκονον ἢ ἕτερόν τινα τῶν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ καταριθμουμένων, ἢ προβάλῃ τοιτο ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἢ οἰκονομον ἢ ἔκδικον ἢ προσμονάριον ἢ ὅλως τινὰ τοῦ κανόνος, δι' αἰσχροκέρδειαν οἰκείαν ὁ τοῦτο ἐπιχειρήσας ἐλεγχθεὶς περὶ τὸν οἰκεῖον κινδυνεύετω βαθμὸν καὶ ὁ χειροτονούμενος μηδὲν ἐκ τῆς κατ' ἐμπορίαν ὠφελείσθω χειροτονίας ἢ προβολῆς, ἀλλ' ἔστω ἀλλότριος τῆς ἀξίας ἢ τοῦ φροντισματος οὐπερ ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἔτυχεν. Εἰ δέ τις καὶ μεσιτεύων φανείῃ τοῖς οὕτως αἰσχροῖς καὶ ἀθεμίτοις λήμμασι, καὶ οὗτος, εἰ μὲν κληρικὸς εἴη, τοῦ οἰκείου ἐκπιπτέτω βαθμοῦ· εἰ δὲ λαϊκὸς ἢ μονάζων, ἀναθεματιζέσθω.

"If a bishop confers ordination for money, and turns the grace which cannot be bought into merchandise, and consecrates a bishop, or chorepiscopus, or priest, or deacon, or any

¹ On the collection of canons which lay before the Synod of Chalcedon, and was approved in its 1st canon, cf. Drey, *Die apostol. Constitutionen und Canones der Apostel*, S. 427 ff.

² Commentaries on this, as on the rest of the canons of Chalcedon, are given by the Greek scholiasts Balsamon, Zonaras, and Aristenus (printed in Bevereg. *Synodicon*, t. i. p. 111 sq.). Further, Beveridge himself, in his *Annotationes*, (*ibid.* t. ii. p. 108 sqq.), and Van Espen, *Commentarius etc.*, l.c. p. 233 sqq.

other cleric, or appoints for money an œconomus, or advocate, or prosmonarios, or any other servant of the Church,¹ for the sake of base gain, upon conviction he shall endanger his own office, and he who is ordained shall have no advantage from his ordination or office obtained by purchase, but shall lose the dignity or the post which he has received for money. But if any one has acted as mediator in these shameful and unlawful transactions, then, if he is a cleric, he shall lose his own post; but if he is a layman or a monk, he shall be anathematized."

As we see, this canon forbids all simony, not only the sale of ordinations and of properly clerical posts, but also the appointment for money to those Church offices for which ordination is not necessary; for example, a steward of Church property, an ecclesiastical advocate or proctor, etc. The difference of the two kinds of offices is designated in our canon (*α*) by the expressions *ἀξία* = clerical dignity, and *φρόντισμα* = administrative position; and (*β*) by the difference between *χειροτονεῖν* and *προβάλλειν*, of which the former refers to specifically spiritual or clerical offices, the latter to the appointment of Church officials. Besides, a distinction must be made between the expressions *ἐν κλήρῳ* and *τινὰ τοῦ κανόνος* to this extent, that, while all clerics are *ἐν τῷ κανόνι* *ἐξεταζόμενοι*, i.e. are contained in the list of the servants of the Church, there could also be among the men *τοῦ κανόνος* those who, without clerical ordination, did business for the Church. Among the servants of the Church the *προσμονάριος* (*Mansionarius*) is also named in our canon, whose duty it was, according to Suicer (*Thesaurus e patribus Græcis*, s.v.), to remain in the church until all had left, and then to shut it up, and also to extinguish the lamps, and again to light them at the proper time. He had at the same time some of the duties of the ancient Ostiarius. According to Van Espen, however, who here supports himself upon Du Cange, by *προσμονάριος* or *Mansionarius*, in the same way as by *οἰκόνομος*, a steward of Church property was to be understood.² He adds, too, that

¹ On the expression *τινὰ τοῦ κανόνος*, cf. vol. i. p. 423.

² Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 231; cf. Beveridge, *l.c.* t. i. p. 112; t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 108.

Bishop Ibas of Edessa had been charged with simony, as appears from the Acts of the tenth session (see above, p. 362), and this may have occasioned the drawing up of our canon. This inserted in the *Corpus. jur. can.* c. 8, C. i. q. 1.

As the ancient monks were almost without exception laymen, they were punished as laymen. Cf. Kober, *Deposition*, etc., S. 341.

CAN. 3.

Ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν Σύνοδον, ὅτι τῶν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ κατειλεγμένων τινὲς δι' οἰκείαν αἰσχροκερδεῖαν, ἀλλοτριῶν κτημάτων γίνονται μισθωταί, καὶ πράγματα κοσμικὰ ἐργολαβοῦσι, τῆς μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ λειτουργίας καταρράθυμούντες, τοὺς δὲ τῶν κοσμικῶν ὑποτρέχοντες οἴκους, καὶ οὐσιῶν χειρισμοὺς ἀναδεχόμενοι διὰ φιλαργυρίαν. Ὡρισε τοίνυν ἡ ἁγία καὶ μεγάλη Σύνοδος, μηδένα τοῦ λοιποῦ, μὴ ἐπίσκοπον, μὴ κληρικόν, μὴ μονάζοντα, ἢ μισθοῦσθαι κτήματα, ἢ πράγματα, ἢ ἐπεισάγειν ἑαυτὸν κοσμικαῖς διοικήσεσιν· πλὴν εἰ μὴ που ἐκ νόμων καλοῖτο εἰς ἀφηλίκων ἀπαραίτητον ἐπιτροπὴν, ἢ ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἐπίσκοπος ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἐπιτρέψῃ φροντίζειν πραγμάτων, ἢ ὀρφανῶν καὶ χηρῶν ἀπρονοήτων, καὶ τῶν προσώπων τῶν μάλιστα τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς δεομένων βοηθείας, διὰ τὸν φόβον τοῦ Κυρίου. Εἰ δέ τις παραβαίνειν τὰ ὠρισμένα τοῦ λοιποῦ ἐπιχειρήσῃ, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὑποκείσθω ἐπιτιμίοις.

"It has become known to the holy Synod that some members of the clergy, from shameful covetousness, hire other people's property, and occupy themselves in worldly business for the sake of gain, disparaging the service of God, and going about among the houses of secular people, and taking in hand the administration of property from love of gain: therefore the holy and great Synod decrees that for the future no bishop, cleric, or monk shall hire goods, or transact business, or mix himself in secular affairs, unless when he is called by the laws to be a guardian of minors, without being able to put off the duty, or when the bishop of the city gives him a commission, for God's sake, to take charge of the affairs of orphans or of unprotected widows, or of those persons who are in especial need of the assistance of the Church. And if any one in

future transgresses these regulations, he shall be subjected to ecclesiastical penalties."

This canon (in the *Corpus jur. can.* c. 26, Dist. lxxxvi.) is almost a verbal repetition of the second of those which the Emperor Marcian had proposed in the sixth session of the Synod, with the addition (a) that a cleric could discharge the office of guardian of infants, widows, and orphans only in case he could not legally decline it; or (b) if the bishop expressly gave him the charge. But again, the latter (c) would only happen when these widows and orphans were otherwise without protection. The Greek mediæval commentator on the canons, Zonaras, complains that unfortunately this prescription was not sufficiently respected in the Byzantine Empire;¹ and Van Espen adds: "Would to God that we, Latins, had not also to lament the same!"²

CAN. 4.

Οἱ ἀληθῶς καὶ εἰλικρινῶς τὸν μονήρῃ μετιόντες βίον τῆς προσηκούσης ἀξιούσθωσαν τιμῆς. Ἐπειδὴ δέ τινες τῷ μοναχικῷ κεχρημένοι προσχήματι τὰς τε ἐκκλησίας καὶ τὰ πολιτικά διαταράττουσι πράγματα, περιιόντες ἀδιαφόρως ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ μοναστήρια ἑαυτοῖς συνιστᾶν ἐπιτηδεύοντες· ἔδοξε μηδένα μηδαμοῦ οἰκοδομεῖν, μηδὲ συνιστᾶν μοναστήριον, ἢ εὐκτήριον οἶκον, παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ τῆς πόλεως ἐπισκόπου· τοὺς δὲ καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν καὶ χώραν μονάζοντας, ὑποτετάχθαι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἀσπάζεσθαι, καὶ προσέχειν μόνῃ τῇ νηστείᾳ καὶ τῇ προσευχῇ, ἐν οἷς τόποις ἐπετάξαντο προσκαρτεροῦντας, μήτε δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς μήτε βιωτικοῖς παρενοχλεῖν πράγμασιν ἢ ἐπικοινωνεῖν, καταλιμπάνοντας τὰ ἴδια μοναστήρια, εἰ μὴ ποτε ἄρα ἐπιτραπέειν διὰ χρεῖαν ἀναγκαίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς πόλεως ἐπισκόπου· μηδένα δὲ προσδέχεσθαι ἐν τοῖς μοναστηρίοις δοῦλον ἐπὶ τῷ μονάσαι παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἰδίου δεσπότη. Τὸν δὲ παραβαίνοντα τοῦτον ἡμῶν τὸν ὅρον, ὥρισamen ἀκοινωνητον εἶναι, ἵνα μὴ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ βλασφημῇται. Τὸν μέντοι ἐπίσκοπον τῆς πόλεως, χρὴ τὴν δέουσαν πρόνοιαν ποιεῖσθαι τῶν μοναστηρίων.

"Those who lead a true and genuine monastic life shall

¹ In Bevereg. *Synodicon*, t. i. p. 113 sqq.; cf. t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 109 sqq.

² *Commentarius* etc., l.c. p. 236.

receive due honour. As, however, some, assuming the monastic state only for a pretext, confuse the affairs of Church and State, and go about in the cities indiscriminately, and at the same time wish to found monasteries for themselves, the Synod decrees that no one shall anywhere build or set up a monastery or a poorhouse without the consent of the bishop of the city; (further) that the monks of each neighbourhood and city shall be subject to the bishop, that they love quiet, and give themselves only to fasting and prayer, stopping in the places to which they are assigned; that they do not encumber themselves with ecclesiastical and secular affairs or take part in them, leaving their monasteries, except when, in case of necessity, they are required to do so by the bishop of the city; that no slave shall be received into the monasteries to become a monk without permission of his master. Whoever transgresses this our ordinance shall be excommunicated, that the name of God be not blasphemed. The bishop of the city ought to take careful oversight of the monasteries."

Like the previous canon, this one was brought forward by the Emperor Marcian in the sixth session, and then as No. 1, and the Synod accepted the Emperor's proposed canon almost verbally. Occasion for this canon seems to have been given by monks of Eutychian tendencies, and especially by the Syrian Barsumas, as appears from the fourth session (see above, p. 336). He and his monks had, as Eutychians, withdrawn themselves from the jurisdiction of their bishops, whom they suspected of Nestorianism.¹—Gratian has inserted our canon in the *Corpus jur. can.* c. 12, C. xvi. q. 1, in part (with the omission of the central portion), and in c. 10, C. xviii. q. 2, has put together the remaining portion with a part of the 8th canon of Chalcedon.

CAN. 5.

Περὶ δὲ τῶν μεταβαίνοντων ἀπὸ πόλεως εἰς πόλιν ἐπισκόπων ἢ κληρικῶν ἔδοξε τοὺς περὶ τούτων τεθέντας κανόνας παρὰ τῶν ἀγίων πατέρων ἔχειν τὴν ἰδίαν ἰσχύν.

"In regard to the bishops and clerics who go from one

¹ Van Espen, *Commentarius* etc., p. 236 sqq.; Bevereg. *l.c.* t. i. p. 116 sqq., and t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 111 sqq.

city to another, the canons set forth by the holy fathers respecting them shall have validity."

The principal occasion for this fresh enforcement of older canons (see vol. i. pp. 185, 195, 422, 423, 463; vol. ii. p. 68) seems to have been given by the affair of Bassianus in the eleventh session.¹ In the *Corpus jur. can.* our canon is found as c. 26, C. xii. q. 1.

CAN. 6.

Μηδένα δὲ ἀπολελυμένως χειροτονεῖσθαι, μήτε πρεσβύτερον μήτε διάκονον μήτε ὅλως τινὰ τῶν ἐν τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ τάγματι, εἰ μὴ ἰδικῶς ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ πόλεως ἢ κώμης, ἢ μαρτυρίῳ ἢ μοναστηρίῳ ὁ χειροτονούμενος ἐπικηρύττοιο. Τοὺς δὲ ἀπολύτως χειροτονουμένους, ὥρισεν ἡ ἁγία Σύνοδος ἄκυρον ἔχειν τὴν τοιαύτην χειροθεσίαν, καὶ μηδαμοῦ δύνασθαι ἐνεργεῖν ἐφ' ὕβρει τοῦ χειροτονήσαντος.

"No one shall be absolutely ordained either priest or deacon, or to any other clerical order, unless he is appointed specially to the church of the city or of the village, or to a martyr's chapel or monastery. In regard to those, however, who have been absolutely ordained, the [holy] Synod decrees that such ordination shall be without effect, and that they shall nowhere be allowed to officiate, to the shame of him who ordained."

It is clear that our canon forbids the so-called absolute ordinations, and requires that every cleric must at the time of his ordination be designated to a definite church. The only *titulus* which is here recognized is that which was later known as *titulus beneficii*. As various kinds of this title we find here (a) the appointment to a church in the city, (b) to a village church, (c) that to the chapel of a martyr, (d) the appointment as chaplain of a monastery. For the right understanding of the last point, it must be remembered that the earliest monks were in nowise clerics, but that soon the custom was introduced in every larger convent, of having at least one monk ordained presbyter, that he might provide for divine service in the monastery.

Similar prohibitions of *ordinationes absolutæ* were also put

¹ Cf. Van Espen, *Commentarius* etc., p. 238; Bevereg. l.c. t. i. p. 118.

forth in after times. The *Corpus jur. can.* inserts our canon as c. i. Dist. lxx., and the Council of Trent renewed (Sess. xxiii. c. 16, *De Reform.*) the prohibition in question, with express reference to the canon of the Council of Chalcedon. According to existing law, absolute ordinations, as is well known, are still *illicite*, but yet *valide*, and even the Council of Chalcedon has not declared them to be properly *invalidæ*, but only as without effect (by permanent suspension). Cf. Kober, *Suspension*, S. 220, and Hergenröther, *Photius* etc., Bd. ii. S. 324.

CAN. 7.

Τοὺς ἅπαξ ἐν κλήρῳ κατειλεγμένους ἢ καὶ μονάσαντας ὥρσαμεν μήτε ἐπὶ στρατείαν μήτε ἐπὶ ἀξίαν κοσμικὴν ἔρχεσθαι ἢ τοῦτο τολμώντας καὶ μὴ μεταμελουμένους, ὥστε ἐπιστρέψαι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ὃ διὰ Θεὸν πρότερον εἶλοντο, ἀναθεματίζεσθαι.

"Those who have been once received into the number of the clergy, or have become monks, must not serve in war, or enter a secular calling: those who venture to do so, and do not repent so as to return to the calling which they had previously chosen for the sake of God, shall be anathematized."

Something similar was ordered by the 83d (82d) apostolic canon, only that it threatens the cleric who takes military service merely with deposition from his clerical office, while our canon subjects him to excommunication. As generally an offence which, in the case of clerics, drew deposition after it, was, in the case of laymen, punished with excommunication,¹ it is clear that our canon treats those clerics and monks who leave their state and serve in war or enter a secular office, exactly as laymen. The Greek commentators Balsamon and Zonaras think that our canon selects a more severe punishment, that of excommunication, because it has in view those clerics who have not merely taken military service, etc., but at the same time have laid aside their clerical dress and put on secular clothing. One who has laid aside the clerical dress is, for this first crime, deposed and degraded, and if he has further taken military service, etc., then the second

¹ Cf. the following canon, and Döllinger, *Hippolyt* etc., S. 138.

punishment, that appointed for laymen, is also inflicted upon him.¹ In the *Corpus jur. can.* this canon stands as c. 3, C. xx. q. 3.

CAN. 8.

Οἱ κληρικοὶ τῶν πτωχείων καὶ μοναστηρίων καὶ μαρτυρίων ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν ἐκάστη πόλει ἐπισκόπων τὴν ἐξουσίαν, κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων παράδοσιν, διαμενέτωσαν, καὶ μὴ καταυθαδιάζεσθαι ἢ ἀφηγιᾶν τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου. Οἱ δὲ τολμῶντες ἀνατρέπειν τὴν τοιαύτην διατύπωσιν καθ' οἷονδ' ἴποτε τρόπον, καὶ μὴ ὑποταττόμενοι τῷ ἰδίῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, εἰ μὲν εἶεν κληρικοὶ, τοῖς τῶν κανόνων ὑποκείσθωσαν ἐπιτιμίῳ, εἰ δὲ μονάζοντες ἢ λαϊκοὶ, ἔστωσαν ἀκοινωνῆτοι.

"The clergy of the poorhouses, monasteries, and martyr chapels shall remain under the jurisdiction of the bishops belonging to the cities, and shall not conduct themselves in a self-willed or disobedient manner towards their own bishops. Those, however, who venture to violate this ordinance in any manner whatever, and do not submit to their bishop, if they are clerics, shall be subject to the canonical penalties, and if they are monks or laymen, they shall be excommunicated."

In its first part our canon speaks only of the clergy and of their subordination to the bishop. As, however, the second part of it refers also to monks and laymen, the Greek commentators Balsamon and Zonaras inferred that our canon subjects not only all clerics, but all monks and laymen, to the bishop of their diocese, and knows nothing of exemptions.²—As has already been remarked (see p. 390), Gratian has woven together our canon with a part of the fourth, as c. 10, C. xviii. q. 2.

CAN. 9.

Εἴ τις κληρικὸς πρὸς κληρικὸν πρᾶγμα ἔχοι, μὴ ἐγκαταλιμπανέτω τὸν οἰκεῖον ἐπίσκοπον καὶ ἐπὶ κοσμικὰ δικαστήρια κατατρεχέτω· ἀλλὰ πρότερον τὴν ὑπόθεσιν γυμναζέτω παρὰ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἥγουν γνώμη αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, παρ' οἷς ἂν τὰ ἀμφότερα μέρη βούλεται τὰ τῆς δίκης συγκροτεῖσθαι.

¹ In Bevereg. *l.c.* t. i. p. 119 sq., t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 114; Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 240.

² Cf. Bevereg. *l.c.* t. i. p. 120 sq.; Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 241.

Εἰ δέ τις παρὰ ταῦτα ποιήσει, κανονικοῖς ὑποκείσθω ἐπιτιμίοις· Εἰ δὲ καὶ κληρικὸς ἔχοι πρᾶγμα πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἐπίσκοπον ἢ πρὸς ἕτερον, παρὰ τῇ συνόδῳ τῆς ἐπαρχίας δικαζέσθω. Εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κληρικὸς ἀμφισβητοίῃ, καταλαμβάνετω ἢ τὸν ἑξαρχον τῆς διοικήσεως ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλευούσης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δικαζέσθω.

"If a cleric has a difference with another cleric, he must not pass by his bishop and have recourse to the secular judges, but he must first unfold the matter before his own bishop, or, if the bishop so wills, the dispute may be settled by umpires who are acceptable to both parties. If any one acts in opposition to this, he shall be subject to the canonical penalties. If a cleric, however, has a difference with his own or with another bishop, he shall bring the dispute before the Synod of the eparchy (province). If, however, a bishop or cleric has a difference with the metropolitan of the province himself, then let him choose either the exarch of the diocese (the superior metropolitan) or the see of Constantinople, and bring the dispute before this."

That our canon would refer not merely the ecclesiastical, but the civil differences of the clergy, in the first case, to the bishop, is beyond a doubt. And it comes out as clearly from the word *πρότερον* (=at first) that it does not absolutely exclude a reference to the secular judges, but regards it as allowable only when the first attempt at an adjustment of the controversy by the bishop has miscarried. This was quite clearly recognized by Justinian in his 123d Novel, c. 21: "If any one has a case against a cleric, or a monk, or a deaconess, or a nun, or an ascetic, he shall first make application to the bishop of his opponent, and he shall decide. If both parties are satisfied with his decision, it shall then be carried into effect by the imperial judge of the locality. If, however, one of the contending parties lodges an appeal against the bishop's judgment within ten days, then the imperial judge of the locality shall decide the matter."¹

There is no doubt that the expression "Exarch" employed in our canon, and also in canon 17, means, in the first place,

¹ In Bevereg. t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 115.

those superior metropolitans who have several ecclesiastical provinces under them. Whether, however, the great patriarchs, properly so called, are to be included under it, may be doubted. The Emperor Justinian, in c. 22 of his Novel just quoted (*l.c.*) in our text has, without further explanation, substituted the expression *Patriarch* for *Exarch*, and in the same way the commentator Aristenus has declared both terms to be identical, adding that only the Patriarch of Constantinople has the privilege of having a metropolitan tried before him who does not belong to his patriarchate, but is subject to another patriarch.—In the same way our canon was understood by Beveridge.¹ Van Espen, on the contrary, thinks that the Synod had here in view only the exarchs in the narrower sense (of Ephesus, Cæsarea), but not the Patriarchs, properly so called, of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, as it would be too great a violation of the ancient canons, particularly of the 6th of Nicæa, to have set aside the proper patriarch, and have allowed an appeal to the Bishop of Constantinople (with this Zonaras also agrees in his explanation of canon 17). Least of all, however, would the Synod have made such a rule for the West, *i.e.* have allowed that any one should set aside the Patriarch of Rome and appeal to the Patriarch of Constantinople, since they themselves, in canon 28, assigned the first place in rank to Rome.²

It appears to me that neither Beveridge etc., nor Van Espen are fully in the right, while each is partially so. With Van Espen we must assume that our Synod, in drawing up this canon, had in view only the Greek Church, and not the Latin as well, particularly as neither the papal legates nor any Latin bishop whatever was present at the drawing up of these canons. On the other hand, Beveridge is also right in maintaining that the Synod made no distinction between the patriarchs proper and the exarchs (such a distinction must otherwise have been indicated in the text), and allowed that quarrels which should arise among the bishops of other patriarchates might be tried at Constantinople. Only that Beveridge ought to have excepted the West and Rome.

¹ Bevereg. *l.c.* t. i. p. 122 sqq., t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 115 sq.

² Van Espen, *Commentarius* etc., *l.c.* p. 241 sq.

The strange part of our canon may be explained in the following manner. There were always many bishops at Constantinople from the most different places, who came there to lay their contentions and the like before the Emperor. The latter frequently transferred the decision to the bishop of Constantinople, who then, in union with the then present bishops from the most different provinces, held a *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* (cf. below, p. 416, and vol. i. p. 4), and gave the sentence required at this (see below, the remarks on canon 28, p. 418 f.). Thus gradually the practice was formed of controversies being decided by bishops of other patriarchates or exarchates at Constantinople, to the setting aside of the proper superior metropolitan, an example of which we have seen (above, p. 189) in that famous Synod of Constantinople, A.D. 448, at which the case of Eutyches was for the first time brought forward.

Both Dionysius and Isidore of Seville translate the word *ἐξάρχων* by *Primates*, and Pope Nicolas I., too, understood by it the Pope, since in a letter to the Greek Emperor Michael he thus referred to our canon: "A metropolitan must, *ex regula*, be accused only before the Primate of the Church, the Pope; in those parts, however, which are near Constantinople, appeal may be made *ex permissione* (from Rome) to the Bishop of Constantinople, and his judgment may suffice."¹ In the *Corpus jur. can.* our canon stands as c. 46, C. xi. q. 1.

CAN. 10.

Μὴ ἐξεῖναι κληρικὸν ἐν δύο πόλεων καταλέγεσθαι ἐκκλησιαίς κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ, ἐν ᾗ τε τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐχειροτονήθη, καὶ ἐν ᾗ προσέφυγεν, ὡς μείζονι δῆθεν, διὰ δόξης κενῆς ἐπιθυμίαν τοὺς δέ γε τοῦτο ποιοῦντας ἀποκαθίστασθαι τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐν ᾗ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐχειροτονήθησαν, καὶ ἐκεῖ μόνον λειτουργεῖν. Εἰ μέντοι ἤδη τις μετετέθη ἐξ ἄλλης εἰς ἄλλην ἐκκλησίαν, μηδὲν τοῖς τῆς προτέρας ἐκκλησίας, ἥτοι τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὴν μαρτυρῶν ἢ πτωχείων ἢ ξενοδοχείων, ἐπικοινωνεῖν πράγμασι. Τοὺς δέ γε τολμῶντας μετὰ τὸν ὅρον τῆς μεγάλης καὶ οἰκουμένης

¹ Nicolai i. *Epist.* 8, ad Michaelē Imperatorem, in Hardouin, t. v. p. 159. Cf., on the other side, Bevereg. *l.c.* t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 116.

ταύτης Συνόδου πράττειν τι τῶν νῦν ἀπηγορευμένων, ὥρισεν ἡ ἁγία Σύνοδος, ἐκπίπτειν τοῦ οἰκείου βαθμοῦ.

"It shall not be lawful for a cleric to be enrolled in the churches of two cities at the same time (in the list of the clergy), namely, in that for which he was at first ordained, and in that to which, as the greater, he has removed from motives of ambition. Those who do this must be sent back to their own church in which they were at first ordained, and must serve there only. If any one, however, is removed from one church to another, he shall then no longer take part in the affairs of the former church, or of the martyr chapels, poor-houses, and hospitals connected with it. If any one shall venture, after this regulation of this great and Œcumenical Synod, to do any of the things now forbidden, the holy Synod decrees that he shall lose his position."

Gratian has divided this canon,¹ and inserted it in two different places of his decree as c. 2, C. xxi. q. 1, and c. 3, C. xxi. q. 2.

CAN. 11.

Πάντας τοὺς πένητας καὶ δεομένους ἐπικουρίας μετὰ δοκιμασίας ἐπιστολίοις εἶτουν εἰρηνικοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς μόνοις ὥρισamen ὁδεύειν καὶ μὴ συστατικοῖς, διὰ τὸ τὰς συστατικὰς ἐπιστολὰς προσήκειν τοῖς οὖσιν μόνοις ἐν ὑπολήψει παρέχσθαι προσώποις.

"All poor persons and such as are in need of support shall, after inquiry made, be provided only with ecclesiastical certificates and letters of peace for their journey, and not with letters of commendation, as the latter are to be given only to those who are marked (suspected)."

The mediæval commentators, Balsamon, Zonaras, and Aristenus,² understand this canon to mean that letters of commendation, *συστατικά*, *commendatitiæ litteræ*, were given to those laymen and clerics who were previously subject to ecclesiastical censure, and therefore were suspected by other bishops, and for this reason needed a special recommendation, in order to be received in another church into the number of

¹ On its contents, cf. Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 243, and Bevereg. *l.c.* t. i. p. 123 sq.

² In Bevereg. *l.c.* t. i. p. 125 sq., and t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 117 and p. 22.

the faithful. The letters of peace (*εἰρηνικαί*), on the contrary, were given to those who were in undisturbed communion with their bishop, and had not the least evil reputation abroad.

Our canon was understood quite differently by the old Latin writers, Dionysius Exiguus and Isidore, who translate the words *ἐν ὑπολήψει* by *personæ honoratiores* and *clariores*, and the learned Bishop Gabriel Aubespine of Orleans has endeavoured to prove, in his notes to our canon, that the *litteræ pacificæ* were given to ordinary believers, and the *commendatitiæ* (*συστατικαί*), on the contrary, only to clerics and to distinguished laymen;¹ and in favour of this view is the 13th canon of Chalcedon. Cf. also on the meaning of *ὑπόληψις*, below, c. 21, p. 406.

CAN. 12.

Ἦλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς, ὥς τινες παρὰ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς θεσμοὺς προσδραμόντες δυναστείαις, διὰ πραγματικῶν βασιλικῶν τὴν μίαν ἐπαρχίαν εἰς δύο κατέτεμον, ὡς ἐκ τούτου δύο μητροπολίτας εἶναι ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ. "Ωρισε τοίνυν ἡ ἁγία Σύνοδος, τοῦ λοιποῦ μηδὲν τοιοῦτο τολμᾶσθαι παρ' ἐπισκόπων, ἐπεὶ τὸν τοιοῦτο ἐπιχειροῦντα ἐκπίπτειν τοῦ οἰκείου βαθμοῦ· ὅσαι δὲ ἤδη πόλεις διὰ γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν τῷ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐτιμήθησαν ὀνόματι, μόνης ἀπολανέτωσαν τῆς τιμῆς καὶ ὁ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν αὐτῆς διοικῶν ἐπίσκοπος, σωζομένων δηλονότι τῇ κατ' ἀλήθειαν μητροπόλει τῶν οἰκείων δικαίων.

"It has become known to us that some, in opposition to the ordinances of the Church, have had recourse to the rulers, and have by imperial edicts (pragmatics) divided an ecclesiastical province in two, so that by that means there are two metropolitans in one province. The holy Synod therefore decrees that for the future no bishop shall venture to do so, since he who ventures upon it shall lose his office. And those cities which have already received the title of metropolis by imperial letters shall, together with the bishop who is over them, enjoy only the title of honour, but the peculiar privileges shall be retained by the true metropolis."

The division into ecclesiastical provinces corresponded, as a rule, to the civil division. Every civil province formed also

¹ Cf. Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 243 sq.

an ecclesiastical eparchy with a metropolitan (cf. vol. i. p. 381 f.). If, then, a civil province were divided into two, this generally had the result that the city which was now elevated to the position of a civil metropolis also rose to the dignity of an ecclesiastical metropolis. The principle, that the ecclesiastical dignity of a city should be regulated by the civil, had been already expressed by the Synod of Antioch, A.D. 341, in its 9th canon; and this was done more clearly by our Council of Chalcedon in canons 17 and 28. But it also occurred (*a*) that some bishops had their sees raised to the rank of an ecclesiastical metropolis, without their cities having obtained the same civil rank; and (*b*) that, when a city became merely a (civil) titular metropolis, its bishop assumed to himself a metropolitan diocese. An example of the first kind we meet with in regard to the church of Berytus; an example of the second kind is furnished by Nicea (see above, pp. 341 and 377 f.). It is probable that those two controversies gave occasion for the drawing up of this canon.¹

Gratian has received only the first part of our canon, as c. 1, Dist. ci.

CAN. 13.

Ξένους κληρικοὺς καὶ ἀναγνώστας ἐν ἑτέρᾳ πόλει δίχα
 συστατικῶν ἑξατάκτων τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου μὴδ' ὅλως
 μηδαμοῦ λειτουργεῖν.

"Strange clerics and readers must on no account officiate in another city without letters of commendation from their own bishop."

Instead of *ἀναγνώστας* two manuscripts (Vatic. and Sforz.) have *ἀγνώστους*, i.e. *unknown* clerics, as synonym for *ξένους*. The mediæval commentators, Balsamon, Zonaras, and Aristenus, had also this reading.² Thus they know nothing of the express mention of readers, which must certainly seem strange here, as readers are already included in the term clerics. The old Latin translations, however, the Prisca, that of Dionysius Exiguus, and that of Isidore, have all translated *lectores*, and therefore must have had *ἀναγνώστας* in their

¹ Cf. Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 244 sq.; Bevereg. *l.c.* t. i. p. 126, t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 177.

² In Bevereg. t. i. p. 129.

manuscripts. Perhaps the Synod meant to say, "All strange clerics, even readers, etc."—On the letters of commendation, compare what was said above (p. 397). The contents of our canon are repeated by the Council of Trent, Sess. xxiii. c. 16, *De Reform.*, thus: "*Nullus præterea clericus peregrinus* (the lectors are not specially mentioned) *sine commendatitiis sui ordinarii litteris ab ullo episcopo ad divina celebranda et sacramenta administranda admittatur.*"

CAN. 14.

Ἐπειδὴ ἔν τισιν ἐπαρχίαις συγκεχώρηται τοῖς ἀναγνώσταις καὶ ψάλλταις γαμεῖν, ὥρισεν ἡ ἀγία Σύνοδος μὴ ἐξεῖναι τινα αὐτῶν ἑτερόδοξον γυναῖκα λαμβάνειν· τοὺς δὲ ἤδη ἐκ τοιούτου γάμου παιδοποιήσαντας, εἰ μὲν ἔφθασαν βαπτίσαι τὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν τεχθέντα παρὰ τοῖς αἰρετικοῖς, προσάγειν αὐτὰ τῇ κοινῳίᾳ τῆς καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας· μὴ βαπτισθέντα δὲ, μὴ δύνασθαι ἔτι βαπτίζειν αὐτὰ παρὰ τοῖς αἰρετικοῖς· μήτε μὴν συνάπτειν πρὸς γάμον αἰρετικῷ ἢ Ἰουδαίῳ ἢ Ἑλληνι, εἰ μὴ ἄρα ἐπαγγέλλοιτο μετατίθεσθαι εἰς τὴν ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν τὸ συναπτόμενον πρόσωπον τῷ ὀρθοδόξῳ. Εἰ δέ τις τοῦτον τὸν ὅρον παραβαίη τῆς ἀγίας Συνόδου, κανονικῶς ὑποκείσθω.

"As it is permitted to the readers and singers, in some provinces, to marry, the holy Synod decrees that none of these shall take a heterodox wife; but those who already have children from such unions (with heretical wives), if they have already allowed them to be baptized by heretics, must bring them to the communion of the Catholic Church. If, however, they are not yet baptized, then they must not allow them to be baptized by heretics, nor to marry heretics or Jews or heathen, unless the person who is to be united with the orthodox party promises to adopt the orthodox faith. If any one transgresses this ordinance of the holy Synod, he shall be punished according to the canons."

According to the Latin translation of Dionysius Exiguus, who speaks only of the *daughters* of the lectors, etc., the meaning may be understood, with Christian Lupus, as being that only their *daughters* must not be married to heretics or Jews or heathen, but that the sons of readers may take wives who are heretics etc., in respect that men are less

easily led to fall away from the faith than women. But the Greek text makes here no distinction between sons and daughters.¹—The first part of our canon is inserted by Gratian, c. 15, Dist. xxxii.

CAN. 15.

Διακόνισσαν μὴ χειροτονεῖσθαι γυναικα πρὸ ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοντα, καὶ ταύτην μετὰ ἀκριβοῦς δοκιμασίας· εἰ δέ γε δεξαμένη τὴν χειροθεσίαν καὶ χρόνον τινὰ παραμείνασα τῇ λειτουργίᾳ ἐαυτὴν ἐπιδῶ γάμῳ, ὑβρίσασα τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριν, ἢ τοιαύτη ἀναθεματιζέσθω μετὰ τοῦ αὐτῇ συναφθέντος.

"No woman shall be ordained a deaconess before she is forty years old, and then after careful trial. If, however, after she has received ordination and has been for some time in the service, she marries, disparaging the grace of God, then she shall be anathematized, together with him who has united himself with her."

In the year 390 a law of the Emperor Theodosius the Great requires that, in accordance with the prescription of the Apostle Paul (1 Tim. v. 9), only women who are sixty years of age should be appointed as deaconesses (*Cod. Theodos. Tit. de episcopis, lex. 27*, and *Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. vii. 16*). Our canon has fallen away a little from the ancient strictness.² It shows, further, that hands were laid upon deaconesses at their consecration; but Morinus, resting upon the authority of Epiphanius (*Hær. 79*), pointed out the distinction between such benediction and the proper clerical ordination.³—In the *Corpus jur. can.* our canon stands as c. 23, C. xxvii. q. 1.

CAN. 16.

Παρθένον ἐαυτὴν ἀναθεῖσαν τῷ Δεσπότῃ Θεῷ, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ μονάζοντα μὴ ἐξεῖναι γάμῳ προσομιλεῖν. Εἰ δέ γε εὐρεθῇεν τοῦτο ποιοῦντες, ἔστωσαν ἀκοινῶνητοι. Ὡρίσαμεν δὲ ἔχειν τὴν αὐθεντίαν τῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς φιλανθρωπίας τὸν κατὰ τόπον ἐπίσκοπον.

"A virgin who has dedicated herself to the Lord God, and

¹ Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 246; Bevereg. t. i. p. 129 sq.

² Cf. Bevereg. *l.c.* t. i. p. 131, and t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 118.

³ Cf. Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 246 sq.

also a monk, shall not be allowed to marry. If they do so, they shall be excommunicated. But the bishop of the place shall have full power to show them kindness."

The last part of the canon gives the bishop authority in certain circumstances not to inflict the excommunication which is threatened in the first part, or again to remove it. Thus all the old Latin translators understood our text; but Dionysius Exiguus and the *Prisca* added *confitentibus*, meaning, "if such a virgin or monk *confess and repent* their fault, then the bishop may be kind to them." That the marriage of a monk is invalid, as was ruled by later ecclesiastical law, our canon does not say; on the contrary, it assumes its validity,¹ as also the marriages contracted by priests until the beginning of the twelfth century were regarded as valid.²

Gratian has inserted our canon twice, c. 12 and 22, C. xxvii. q. 1; the first time, where he ascribed it falsely to the *Concilium Tiburicense*, in the translation of Dionysius Exiguus, the second time, under the name of the Synod of Chalcedon, in the translation of Isidore.

CAN. 17.

Τὰς καθ' ἐκάστην ἐκκλησίαν ἀγροικικὰς παροικίας ἢ ἐγχω-
ρίους μένειν ἀπαρασαλεύτους παρὰ τοῖς κατέχουσιν αὐτὰς
ἐπισκόποις, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ τριακονταετὴ χρόνον ταύτας ἀβιάσ-
τως διακατέχοντες ὥκονόμησαν. Εἰ δὲ ἐντὸς τῶν τριάκοντα
ἐτῶν γεγέννηται τις ἢ γένηται περὶ αὐτῶν ἀμφισβήτησις,
ἐξεῖναι τοῖς λέγουσιν ἡδικῆσθαι περὶ τούτων κινεῖν παρὰ τῇ
Συνόδῳ τῆς ἐπαρχίας. Εἰ δὲ τις παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀδικοῖτο
μητροπολίτου παρὰ τῷ ἐπάρχῳ τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τῷ Κωνσταν-
τινουπόλεως θρόνῳ δικαζέσθω, καθὰ προείρηται. Εἰ δὲ τις
ἐκ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας ἐκαινίσθη πόλις ἢ αὐθις καινισθεῖη,
τοῖς πολιτικοῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τύποις καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν
παροικιῶν ἢ τάξεις ἀκολουθεῖτω.

"The village or country parishes belonging to each church shall remain unaltered with those bishops who have them,

¹ Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 247.

² Cf. my essay on the celibate in my *Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte etc.*, Tübingen, 1864, §. 133 f.

particularly if these have exercised jurisdiction over them for thirty years without dispute. If, however, within a period of thirty years a controversy has arisen, or shall arise, then those who allege that they have been injured may bring the matter before the synod of the eparchy. If, however, in such a case a bishop believes that his own metropolitan has wronged him, then he shall bring the dispute before the eparchy of the diocese (superior metropolitan), or before the see of Constantinople, as was said before. If the Emperor has newly raised, or shall raise, a place to the dignity of a city, then the regulation of ecclesiastical parishes shall follow the political and civil arrangement."

The meaning of our canon is: "When it is doubtful, in the case of a country parish which lies between two bishoprics, to which of them it belongs, it shall remain with that bishop by whom it has been administered without dispute for thirty years. If, however, no such period has thus elapsed, then the two bishops who contend for the possession of the country parish shall bring their dispute before the provincial synod, and in case one of them is the metropolitan himself, they shall bring it before the Exarch or the Bishop of Constantinople. If a village, etc., is raised to the position of a city by the Emperor, then the village church shall also be an episcopal church [cathedral], and have its own bishop; and as the newly founded city is now no longer a chapelry to its neighbour, but is immediately subjected to the civil metropolis of the province, so shall also the bishop of the new city be placed immediately under the ecclesiastical metropolitans of the province, and not under the bishop to whom the church previously belonged as a village church."¹ In the text of our canon two kinds of country parishes are distinguished, the *ἀγροικικαὶ* and the *ἐγχώριοι*. The Greek commentators say (*i.e.*) that by the former are meant only quite small chapelries with a few houses, but by the latter, actual villages.—On the subject of the privilege here conceded to the see of Constantinople, compare above the remarks on canon 9; on the principle that the ecclesiastical division is regulated by

¹ Cf. the Greek commentators in Bevereg. *l.c.* t. i. p. 133 sqq., t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 120; Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 248.

the civil, compare our remarks on canon 12 (above, p. 398 f.) and canon 28 (below, p. 410 ff.).

CAN. 18.

Τὸ τῆς συνωμοσίας ἢ φρατρίας ἔγκλημα καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἔξω νόμων πάντῃ κεκώλυται· πολλῶ δὴ μᾶλλον ἐν τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦτο γίνεσθαι ἀπαγορεύειν προσήκει. Εἴ τινες τοίνυν ἢ κληρικοὶ ἢ μονάζοντες εὐρεθεῖεν συνομνύμενοι ἢ φρατριάζοντες, ἢ κατασκευὰς τυρεύοντες ἐπισκόποις ἢ συγκληρικοῖς, ἐκπιπτέτωσαν πάντῃ τοῦ οἰκείου βαθμοῦ.

“Secret unions and associations are forbidden even by the secular laws; and much more is it becoming that they should be forbidden in the Church of God. If, then, clerics or monks are found to conspire or to combine or to make intrigues against their bishops or their brother clerics, they shall certainly lose their office.”

Occasion for this canon was probably given by the conspiracy of some clergy of Edessa against their bishop, Ibas, of which we spoke before (p. 358). Gratian has twice inserted our canon partially, in c. 21 and 23, C. xi. q. 1.

CAN. 19.

Ἦλθεν εἰς τὰς ἡμετέρας ἀκοὰς, ὡς ἐν ταῖς ἐπαρχίαις αἱ κεκανονισμένοι σύνοδοι τῶν ἐπισκόπων οὐ γίνονται, καὶ ἐκ τούτου πολλὰ παραμελεῖται τῶν διορθώσεως δεομένων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων· ὥρισε τοίνυν ἡ ἁγία Σύνοδος κατὰ τοὺς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων κανόνας, δις τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συντρέχειν καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τοὺς ἐπισκόπους, ἔνθα ἂν ὁ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος δοκιμάσῃ, καὶ διορθοῦν ἕκαστα τὰ ἀνακύπτοντα· τοὺς δὲ μὴ συνιόντας ἐπισκόπους ἐνδημοῦντας ταῖς ἑαυτῶν πόλεσι, καὶ ταῦτα ἐν ὑγιείᾳ διάγοντας, καὶ πάσης ἀπαραιτήτου καὶ ἀναγκαίας ἀσχολίας ὄντας ἐλευθέρους, ἀδελφικῶς ἐπιπλήττεσθαι.

“It has come to our ears that in the eparchies (provinces) the synods of bishops prescribed by the canons are not held, and therefore many ecclesiastical matters which need improvement are neglected. The holy Synod therefore decrees that, in accordance with the canons of the holy fathers, the bishops of each province shall assemble twice a year wherever

it seems good to the metropolitan, and regulate all the cases which come before them. Those bishops who do not appear, but remain in their cities, and are in good health, and free from all unavoidable and necessary business, shall be fraternally punished."

The Nicene Council had already, in its fifth canon, put forth the necessary regulations respecting the holding of provincial Synods, and to these the present Council in the canon before us simply refers.¹ Gratian inserted it in c. 6, Dist. xviii.

CAN. 20.

Κληρικοὺς εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τελοῦντας, καθὼς ἤδη ὥρισamen, μὴ ἐξεῖναι εἰς ἄλλης πόλεως τάττεσθαι ἐκκλησίαν, ἀλλὰ στέργειν ἐκείνην ἐν ᾗ ἐξ ἀρχῆς λειτουργεῖν ἠξιώθησαν, ἐκτὸς ἐκείνων οὔτινες ἀπολέσαντες τὰς ἰδίας πατρίδας ἀπὸ ἀνάγκης εἰς ἄλλην ἐκκλησίαν μετῆλθον. Εἰ δέ τις ἐπίσκοπος μετὰ τὸν ὅρον τοῦτον ἄλλῳ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέκοντα δέξεται κληρικόν, ἔδοξεν ἀκοινῶνητον εἶναι καὶ τὸν δεχθέντα καὶ τὸν δεξάμενον, ἕως ἂν ὁ μεταστὰς κληρικός εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν ἐπανέλθῃ ἐκκλησίαν.

"Clerics who serve in one church, as we have already ordered, must not be removed to the church of another city, but must remain attached to that church at which they were authorized to serve from the beginning, with the exception of those who had lost their home, and so have, from necessity, passed over to another church. If a bishop, in opposition to this ordinance, receives a cleric who belongs to another bishop, then he who is received, and he who receives him, shall be excluded from communion, until the deserting cleric has returned to his own church."

In their 5th canon our Synod had already forbidden in general terms the translation of the clergy, but now they put forth a more detailed regulation on the subject, which is nothing but a verbal repetition of the third article previously proposed (Sess. vi.) by the Emperor Marcian.

Whether by the threatened "exclusion," excommunication proper=anathema is to be understood, is doubtful. Van Espen thinks it means only, either that with such an one the

¹ Cf. vol. i. p. 386 f., and Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 249.

other bishops are temporarily to break off intercourse,¹ or that he shall be suspended from the exercise of his episcopal functions until he has sent back the cleric. The latter penalty, the suspension *ab exercitio pontificalium*, was by later Synods, particularly that of Trent, pronounced upon the bishop who ordained a stranger.²

Similar prohibitions of removal from one church to another were given by the Synods of Nicæa (canons 15 and 16) and Sardica (canons 1 and 2), which should be compared (see vol. i. p. 422 f., and vol. ii. p. 109 ff.). In the *Corpus jur. can.* our canon stands as c. 4, Dist. lxxi.

CAN. 21.

Κληρικούς ἢ λαϊκοὺς κατηγοροῦντας ἐπισκόπων ἢ κληρικῶν, ἀπλῶς καὶ ἀδοκιμάστως μὴ προσδέχεσθαι, εἰ μὴ πρότερον ἐξετασθῇ αὐτῶν ἡ ὑπόληψις.

"Clerics or laymen who bring a complaint against bishops or clerics shall not be listened to without further evidence and inquiry, unless their testimony is first examined."

A detailed regulation on this subject is given in vol. ii. p. 363 ff. [2d canon of Constantinople], which may be regarded as a commentary on our canon. The latter is found in the *Corpus jur. can.* as c. 49, C. ii. q. 7.

CAN. 22.

Μὴ ἐξεῖναι κληρικοῖς μετὰ θάνατον τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου διαρπάξιν τὰ διαφέροντα αὐτῷ πράγματα, καθὼς καὶ τοῖς πάλαι κανόσιν ἀπηγόρευται· τοὺς δὲ τοῦτο ποιοῦντας κινδυνεύειν εἰς τοὺς ἰδίους βαθμούς.

"It is not allowed to clerics, after the death of their bishop, to appropriate to themselves the (private) property belonging to him, a thing which is forbidden by the ancient canons. Those who so act shall be in danger of losing their posts."

The ancient canons which are here mentioned are the 40th

¹ An *excommunicatio* of the kind which allows the bishop to remain in union with his diocese (and with the whole Church), but which excludes him for a time from intercourse with the other bishops, is mentioned also in the ordinances of the sixth Carthaginian Synod of A.D. 401, c. 11. See vol. ii. p. 424 f.

² Cf. Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 250; Kober, *Suspension*, Tübingen, 1862, S. 292 f.

(39th) Apostolic and the 24th Antiochene of A.D. 341. Cf. vol. i. p. 474 and vol. ii. p. 73. Instead of τοῖς πάλαι κατόσι, Zonaras and Balsamon read τοῖς παραλαμβάνουσιν, so that it gives the meaning: "as this is also forbidden to the metropolitans, who have for a time to take charge of that which is left by the deceased, and hold it by themselves (παραλαμβάνειν)." The incorrectness of this reading was shown by Beveridge, and Van Espen agreed with him.¹ Dr. Nolte has, however, remarked (in a letter to me of August 7, 1874), that instead of the meaningless παραλαμβάνουσιν we should read: τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν, i.e., in *anterioribus, jam prius editis canonibus*. Gratian has inserted our canon as c. 43, C. xii. q. 2.

CAN. 23.

Ἦλθεν εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς τῆς ἁγίας Συνόδου, ὡς κληρικοί τινες καὶ μονάζοντες, μηδὲν ἐγκεχειρισμένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, ἔστι δὲ ὅτε καὶ ἀκοινώνητοι γενόμενοι παρ' αὐτοῦ, καταλαμβάνοντες τὴν βασιλεύουσαν Κωνσταντινούπολιν, ἐπὶ πολὺ ἐν αὐτῇ διατρίβουσι, ταραχὰς ἐμποιοῦντες καὶ θορυβοῦντες τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν κατάστασιν, ἀνατρέπονσί τε οἴκους τινῶν. Ὡρισε τοίνυν ἡ ἁγία Σύνοδος, τοὺς τοιούτους ὑπομνήσκεσθαι μὲν πρότερον διὰ τοῦ ἐκδίκου τῆς κατὰ Κωνσταντινούπολιν ἀγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας ἐπὶ τῷ ἐξελθεῖν τῆς βασιλευούσης πόλεως· εἰ δὲ τοῖς αὐτοῖς πράγμασιν ἐπιμένοιεν ἀναισχυνοῦντες, καὶ ἄκοντας αὐτοὺς διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκδίκου ἐκβάλλεσθαι καὶ τοὺς ἰδίους καταλαμβάνειν τόπους.

"It has come to the ears of the holy Synod that certain clerics and monks, without having commission from their bishop, and even when excommunicated by him, have betaken themselves to the chief city, Constantinople, and remained there a long time, exciting disturbances and destroying ecclesiastical order, and disturbing private houses. The holy Synod therefore decrees that such shall first be admonished by the Ecdicus (advocate) of the most holy Church of Constantinople to leave the city; if, however, they shamelessly persist in the same line of conduct, they shall be expelled by the same Ecdicus, and shall return to their home."—In Gratian, c. 17, C. xvi. q. 1.

¹ Bevereg. *l.c.* t. i. p. 138, t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 122; Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 250.

CAN. 24.

Τὰ ἅπαξ καθιερωθέντα μοναστήρια κατὰ γνώμην ἐπισκόπου μένειν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς μοναστήρια, καὶ τὰ προσήκοντα αὐτοῖς πράγματα φυλάττεσθαι τῷ μοναστηρίῳ, καὶ μηκέτι δύνασθαι γίνεσθαι ταῦτα κοσμικὰ καταγώγια· τοὺς δὲ συγχωροῦντας τοῦτο γενέσθαι, ὑποκεῖσθαι τοῖς ἐκ τῶν κανόνων ἐπιτιμίαις.

"Convents once consecrated by the will of the bishop shall always remain convents, and the goods belonging to them shall be kept for the convent. The convents must not again become secular dwellings. Whoever allows their being again changed into such shall be subject to the canonical penalties."

That convents should not be erected without the consent of the bishops, our Synod ordered in its 4th canon. It now forbids the secularization of the already existing convents, and threatens those who do this with the penalties appointed by the canons.—As, however, no older canon is known which specially treats of this kind of offence, we must suppose that the expression "canonical penalties" is identical with "ecclesiastical penalties."—In Gratian, c. 4, C. xix. q. 3.

CAN. 25.

Ἐπειδὴ δέ τινες τῶν μητροπολιτῶν, ὡς περιηχήθημεν, ἀμελοῦσι τῶν ἐγκεχειρισμένων αὐτοῖς ποιμνίων καὶ ἀναβάλλονται τὰς χειροτονίας τῶν ἐπισκόπων, ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ Συνόδῳ ἐντὸς τριῶν μηνῶν γίνεσθαι τὰς χειροτονίας τῶν ἐπισκόπων, εἰ μὴ ποτε ἄρα ὑπαραίτητος ἀνάγκη παρασκευάσῃ ἐπιταθῆναι τὸν τῆς ἀναβολῆς χρόνον· εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο ποιήσῃ, ὑποκεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἐκκλησιαστικῷ ἐπιτιμίῳ· τὴν μέντοι πρόσδοδον τῆς χηρευούσης ἐκκλησίας σώαν φυλάττεσθαι παρὰ τῷ οἰκονόμῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

"As, according to what we have heard, certain metropolitans neglect the flocks committed to them, and put off the consecrations of bishops, the Synod decrees that the consecrations of bishops must be celebrated within three months, unless an unavoidable necessity occasions the prolongation of the time. If a metropolitan acts otherwise, he shall be subject to the canonical penalty. The revenues of

the endowed Church shall be preserved undiminished by the steward of the Church."

Here, too, the expression "canonical penalty" must be taken with the same general meaning as in the former canon, since no older canon specially treats of the manner in which a metropolitan who postpones the consecration of a suffragan is to be punished.—The three months, however, within which the new consecration is to take place, are, according to the meaning of our canon, to be reckoned from the day of the vacancy. Something similar to this regulation of our Synod is that of the Council of Trent, Sess. xxiii. c. 2, *De Reform.*, that the elected bishops shall within three months (of the papal confirmation) present themselves for consecration. If they do not, they must restore the income which they have already enjoyed; and if they do not have themselves consecrated within six months, they lose the bishopric.—The Council of Trent, however, threatens only those who are to be consecrated, and not also the metropolitans, because for a long time many of the former had been accustomed to put off the reception of consecration, while the metropolitans did not delay the bestowal of it. Finally, the Tridentine Council made regulations similar to those of the canon before us in reference to the income of a diocese during a vacancy, in Sess. xxiv. c. 16, *De Reform.*¹—In the *Corpus jur. can.* the ordinance of Chalcedon appears as c. 2, Dist. lxxv.

CAN. 26.

Ἐπειδὴ ἐν τισιν ἐκκλησίαις, ὡς περιχίθημεν, δίχα οἰκονόμων οἱ ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικά χειρίζουσι πράγματα, ἔδοξε πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπίσκοπον ἔχουσαν καὶ οἰκονόμον ἔχειν ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου κλήρου, οἰκονομοῦντα τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικά κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου· ὥστε μὴ ἀμάρτυρον εἶναι τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ἐκ τούτου τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας σκορπίζεσθαι πράγματα, καὶ λειδορίαν τῇ ἱερwsύνῃ προστρίβεσθαι· εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο ποιήσῃ, ὑποκείσθαι αὐτὸν τοῖς θείοις κανόσι.

"As, according to what we have heard, in some churches

¹ Cf. Van Espen, *l.c.* p. 251 sq.; Bevereg. *l.c.* t. i. p. 141, and t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 123.

the bishops administer the property of the Church without stewards, the Synod decrees, that every church which has a bishop must also have a steward from its own clergy, who shall administer the property of the Church by commission from his bishop; so that the administration of the Church may not be uncontrolled, and thereby the property of the Church exposed to waste, and the clerical character exposed to evil fame."

The subject of ecclesiastical *œconomi* of ancient times is fully treated in the remarks of Beveridge and Van Espen upon our canon; further, by Binterim, Thomassin, and Hergenröther.¹—The *Corpus jur. can.* has our canon twice, c. 21, C. xvi. q. 7, and c. 4, Dist. lxxix.

CAN. 27.

Τοὺς ἀρπάζοντας γυναῖκας καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματι συνοικεσίου, ἢ συμπράττοντας ἢ συναίνουντας τοῖς ἀρπάζουσιν, ὥρισεν ἡ ἁγία Σύνοδος, εἰ μὲν κληρικοὶ εἶεν, ἐκπίπτειν τοῦ οἰκείου βαθμοῦ, εἰ δὲ λαϊκοὶ, ἀναθεματίζεσθαι αὐτούς.

"In regard to those who carry off women, even when it is done that they may live with (marry) them, further, in regard to those who assist those who carry them off, and approve of their action, the holy Synod decrees, that, if they are clerics, they shall lose their office, and, if they are laymen, they shall be anathematized."—Cf. *Corpus jur. can.* c. 1, C. xxxvi. q. 2.

CAN. 28.

Πανταχοῦ τοῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὅροις ἐπόμενοι, καὶ τὸν ἀρτίως ἀναγνωσθέντα κανόνα τῶν ἐκατὸν πεντήκοντα θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων γνωρίζοντες, τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὀρίζομεν καὶ ψηφίζομεθα περὶ τῶν πρεσβείων τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας τῆς αὐτῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, νέας Ῥώμης. Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδόκασιν τὰ πρεσβεῖα, καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι

¹ Bevereg. l.c. t. ii. *Annot.* p. 123 sq.; Van Espen, l.c. p. 153; Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, Bd. i. Thl. ii. S. 9-47; Thomassin, *De nova et veteri eccl. discipl.* P. iii. lib. ii. c. 1, ed. Mog. t. viii. p. 1 sqq.; Hergenröther, *Photius*, Bd. i. S. 96 f. [Cf. also art. "Œconomus" in *Dicty. of Chr. Antiquities*.]

οἱ ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεία ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἀγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ, εὐλόγως κρίναντες τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ συγκλήτῳ τιμηθεῖσαν πόλιν, καὶ τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύουσιν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκείνην μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι, δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχουσιν, καὶ ὥστε τοὺς τῆς Ποντικῆς καὶ τῆς Ἀσιανῆς καὶ τῆς Θρακικῆς διοικήσεως μητροπολίτας μόνους, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς ἐπισκόπους τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων χειροτονεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ προειρημένου ἀγιωτάτου θρόνου τῆς κατὰ Κωνσταντινουπόλιν ἀγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας, δηλαδὴ ἐκάστου μητροπολίτου τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων μετὰ τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπων χειροτονούντος τοὺς τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπους, καθὼς τοῖς θείοις κανόσι διηγόρεται· χειροτονεῖσθαι δὲ, καθὼς εἴρηται, τοὺς μητροπολίτας τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων παρὰ τοῦ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀρχιεπισκόπου, ψηφισμάτων συμφώνων κατὰ τὸ ἔθος γενομένων, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀναφερομένων.

"As in all things we follow the ordinances of the holy fathers, and know the recently read canon of the 150 bishops (at the second Œcumenical Synod), so do we decree the same in regard to the privileges of the most holy Church of Constantinople (= New Rome). Rightly have the fathers conceded to the see of Old Rome its privileges on account of its character as the imperial city, and moved by the same considerations the 150 bishops have awarded the like privileges to the most holy see of New Rome, judging with good reason that the city which is honoured by the imperial power and the senate (that is, where the Emperor and the senate reside), and which (in a civil respect) enjoys the same privileges as the ancient imperial city, should also in its ecclesiastical relations be exalted, and hold the second place after that.¹

¹ According to the Greek text which goes on with καὶ ὥστε it remains doubtful whether that which follows is a decree of the second (Œcumenical Synod or was first drawn up by our Council, i.e. whether καὶ ὥστε is to be connected with ἡμεῖς ὀρίζομεν, or with ἀπένειμαν . . . κρίναντες. But as (a) the canon in question, the third of the second (Œcumenical Council, says nothing of the dioceses of Pontus, etc., and also (b) as in that copy of it which our Council used and had read in its next (sixteenth) session nothing of this kind is contained, it is clear that the second half of our canon from καὶ ὥστε onwards contains a new decision of our Council. Cf. Bevereg. l.c. t. ii. Annotat. p. 125.

And (we decree) that for the dioceses of Pontus, Asia (Proconsularis), and Thrace, only the metropolitans, but in those of the neighbourhoods of the dioceses named which are inhabited by barbarians, also the (ordinary) bishops, shall be consecrated from the holy see of the Church of Constantinople; while, naturally, each metropolitan in the dioceses named shall, in union with the bishops of the eparchy, consecrate the new bishops of those dioceses, as it is ordered in the holy canons. The metropolitans of the dioceses named shall, however, as has been said, be consecrated by the Archbishop of Constantinople, after their election has been first unanimously agreed upon in the customary manner, and the election has been made known to the Bishop of Constantinople."

Since Constantinople had been made the imperial residence and second capital of the empire by the Emperor Constantine the Great, and had received the title of New Rome, the bishops of that city had begun to make the attempt to elevate their rank, and to obtain an equal position with the Roman bishop. They gained a foundation for this in the principle which had become a rule with the Greeks, that the ecclesiastical rank of a bishopric should be regulated in accordance with the civil rank of its city (cf. canon 9 of the Synod of Antioch of A.D. 341, vol. ii. p. 69). This principle had in the Greek Church been carried into practice without opposition, and the Synod of Chalcedon had no hesitation in expressing it nakedly in the 17th canon, and in that which is now before us. It also evidently had the same principle as the foundation of a previous regulation (canon 12). Consequently it also says that even Old Rome had received its privileged ecclesiastical position, and the fathers had *bestowed* this upon it, on account of its character as chief city. The latter is evidently quite unhistorical, for if any one had been able, in the course of time, to grant for the first time its prerogatives to the Roman see, this would have been possible only to an Œcumenical Synod, as the see of Constantinople was able to receive its privileges only through two Œcumenical Synods. But the first Œcumenical Council of Nicæa did not first establish the ecclesiastical rank of Rome, but simply recognized it, as its

6th canon shows (vol. i. p. 388 ff.), and as the whole of ancient Church history testifies.

But the other assertion, too, that the ecclesiastical rank of a city had always been regulated by its civil rank, and must always be regulated in accordance with this, was rightly contested and opposed by Pope Leo the Great (*Ep.* 104, n. 3): "There is a difference," he says, "between the secular and ecclesiastical order (*alia tamen ratio est rerum secularium, alia divinarum*), and it is the apostolical origin of a church, its being founded by an apostle, which gives it a right to a higher hierarchical rank." The apostles had certainly founded the first churches in the greatest and most distinguished cities because those natural centres of intercourse must necessarily serve as a useful substratum for the more rapid extension of Christianity, and thus it came to pass, as a matter of fact, that in ancient times the cities having civil metropolitan rank were also the ecclesiastical capitals. But the real origin of the hierarchical rank was not the civil quality of the city, but the high antiquity and the apostolic origin of its church.¹ This was strikingly expressed by S. Cyprian. Rome is to him the *ecclesia principalis* and the centre of unity, *unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*, because it is the *Cathedra Petri* (*Ep.* 52, p. 86, ed. Rig.). To the same effect the Council of Sardica says: *Hoc enim optimum et valde congruentissimum esse videbitur, si ad caput, i.e. ad Petri sedem de singulis quibusque provinciis Domini referant sacerdotes.*² The same principle is set forth by S. Augustine: *Dominus fundamenta ecclesiæ in apostolicis sedibus collocavit*, and every church must have its position from the *radices apostolicarum sedium*. So Pope Pelagius I. expresses the principle of Augustine, *Ad Episcopos Tusciæ*, a. 556.³ Further, S. Augustine, in his 43d Epistle (§ 7, *alias Ep.* 162), speaks of the precedence of the apostolic Churches, and exclaims to Petilian: *Cathedra tibi quid fecit ecclesiæ Romanæ, in qua Petrus sedet, et in qua hodie Anastasius*

¹ [It is hardly necessary to point out that this statement would not be conceded by any but Roman Catholics. See Bishop Lightfoot's note in his edition of the works of S. Clement of Rome, p. 252 ff.]

² *Ep. ad Julium Episc. Rom.* in Mansi, t. iii. p. 40; Hardouin, t. i. p. 653; cf. vol. ii. p. 163 f.

³ Mansi, t. ix. p. 716.

*sedit ; vel ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ in qua Jacobus sedit, et in qua hodie Joannes sedit ?*¹ In agreement with this Pope Leo the Great, in his letter to the Emperor Marcian, says : "Anatolius of Constantinople must be satisfied to be bishop of the imperial residence city, he cannot make it an apostolic see."² In another letter (*Ep.* 106) he derives the rank of Alexandria from the Evangelist Mark, that of Antioch from the Apostle Peter. In the 104th Epistle, already quoted, Pope Leo also acknowledges the other element, namely, that the *privilegia ecclesiarum* are *instituta* by the *canones sanctorum patrum*, and specially brings forward the fact that the Synod of Nicæa has settled them.

The effort of the bishops of Constantinople to reach a higher rank obtained its first successful result by means of the second Œcumenical Synod (see vol. ii. p. 357 f.). This Council held itself bound to confirm in its 2d canon the privileges of the great superior metropolitans approved at Nicæa, and particularly to the Church of Alexandria the primacy in Egypt, to the Church of Antioch the primacy in the East, to the Church of Ephesus the primacy in *Asia proconsularis*, to the Church of Cæsarea that in Pontus. In the same way this canon speaks of the diocese of Thrace, but *tacite* already regards Constantinople as the ecclesiastical capital of Thrace, instead of the previous metropolis, Heraclea, and in canon 3 takes the further step of giving to this new exarchal see the rank immediately after that of Rome, and thus violates the rights of precedence belonging to Alexandria and Antioch, which had been guaranteed at Nicæa.

Quesnel maintains that the Roman legates at the Council of Chalcedon had formally recognized these new prerogatives of Constantinople, namely, its rank immediately after Rome.³ When, in the first session of Chalcedon, the Acts of the Robber-Synod were read, it was found that the deceased Archbishop Flavian of Constantinople was there mentioned only

¹ *Contra litteras Petiliani*, ii. c. 51, ed. Migne, t. ix. p. 300.

² *Non dedignetur (Anatolius) regiam civitatem, quam apostolicam non potest facere sedem.* *Epist.* 104, n. 3, in the ed. of the Ballerini, t. i. p. 1143 sqq. ; Mansi, t. vi. p. 191.

³ In his *Dissert. de vita etc. S. Leonis M. ad ann. 452*, n. 4, in Baller. t. ii. p. 521.

quinto loco. At this discovery the Oriental bishops exclaimed: "Why did not Flavian receive his position?" And the papal legate Paschasius remarked upon this: "We will, please God, recognize the present Bishop Anatolius of Constantinople as the *first* (after us), but Dioscurus made Flavian the fifth."¹

We concede that the words of Paschasius seem to contain a recognition (although not express) of the 3d canon of Constantinople; but, on the other hand, it is to be observed that the second apostolic legate, Lucentius, in the sixteenth session of Chalcedon, declared most definitely that the regulation on the subject by the 150 bishops at Constantinople, which eighty years before had been put forth in opposition to the Nicene decree, had *not* been admitted into the collection of canons (received at Rome).² The like was maintained by Pope Leo the Great in his 106th letter to Anatolius: "That document of certain bishops (*i.e.* the 3d canon of the Council of the year 381) has never been brought by your predecessors to the knowledge of the apostolic see" (cf. vol. ii. p. 371). In another place (*Ep.* 105 to Pulcheria) he says: "To this concession (of the 150 bishops) a long course of years has given no effect," and by this he means that Rome and the West have not recognized it, for that the 3d canon of Constantinople had passed into practice in the East, the Pope was certainly not unaware.

Having these important utterances in view, we cannot possibly see, in the words of Paschasius adduced by Quesnel, a *formal recognition* of the 3d canon of Constantinople; but we may venture to assert that the papal legate was able to concede to Anatolius of Constantinople, without difficulty, the first rank and seat (after Rome) among the voters at Chalcedon, because (*a*) the Patriarch of Alexandria, Dioscurus (as well as Juvenal of Jerusalem), was in the position of one accused; and (*b*) in regard to Antioch, it was doubtful whether Maximus or Domnus was the legitimate bishop.

But although Rome and the West had not acknowledged the 3d canon of the second Œcumenical Synod, the precedence of the Bishop of Constantinople in the East had passed into use, and so early as 394 Nectarius of Constanti-

¹ Cf. above, p. 303, and Mansi, t. vi. p. 607; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 83.

² Mansi, t. vii. p. 442; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 635 sq.

nople presided, without any opposition, at a Synod, at which the Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria and Flavian of Antioch were present (see vol. ii. p. 406). So Sisinnius of Constantinople presided at a Council in the year 426, at which Theodotus of Antioch was also present (see vol. ii. p. 482). But the bishops of Constantinople were not yet satisfied with the privilege conceded to them by the second Synod, but, on the contrary, had endeavoured, in the course of time, to enlarge it in various ways. The first opportunity for this was given by the circumstance that, in spite of the prohibition of Sardica (see vol. ii. pp. 135 ff., 157 f.), almost continually bishops came from all parts of the empire to Constantinople, in order to present this or that concern, or some complaint or other, before the Emperor. Either the Emperor decided the matter himself, but generally after taking counsel with the bishop of his residence, or else he directed the parties to the bishop and his Synod (cf. above, p. 396). This was the often mentioned and specially assembled *σύνδοδος ἐνδημοῦσα*, a *σύνδοδος* of the bishops present at the time in the city (*ἐνδημούντων*), from the most different neighbourhoods, at which the Bishop of Constantinople presided. This Synod, among other things, not unfrequently decided controversies between bishops and metropolitans, which belonged entirely to other patriarchates, as, for example, that Synod of the year 448, at which Flavian of Constantinople punished Eutyches with anathema (see p. 189 f.). This encroachment, although not sanctioned by the canons, had yet, by the consent of the parties, become a kind of privilege or customary right. To this the following was added: The high consideration in which the bishop of the residence stood, and his influence at Court, brought it about that in important cases he was invited to Synods and the like even outside the exarchate of Thrace, when it was sought by his presence to avoid controversies which threatened in connection with the election of a new bishop, or to decide an election which had become contested, and to depose illegitimate or unworthy bishops. Such invitations were permitted according to the 2d canon of the second Œcumenical Council. In such cases he naturally had the presidency, and, in partieuclar, the consecration of newly-elected bishops

was willingly left to him, in order by that means to have a powerful assistant against any opponents that might arise.¹

Even in the second year after the holding of the second Œcumenical Synod, we see how Nectarius of Constantinople, in the year 383, pronounced the sentence in the business of a bishop in Cappadocia, who, however, belonged to the exarchate of Cæsarea; and it was to the same Nectarius that S. Ambrose applied, in order to procure the deposition of Gerontius, who had left the Church of Milan and had himself consecrated bishop of Nicomedia.² That which was already existing in the time of S. Chrysostom was shaped more definitely by him, so that Theodoret says of him that he ruled the three dioceses of Thrace, Asia, and Pontus, with twenty-eight provinces.³ In particular, he held, in the year 400, at Constantinople a *σύνδος ἐνδημούσα* for the deposition of the Exarch Antonine of Ephesus, and presided in the same year over a Synod at Ephesus, which deposed six Asiatic bishops for simony, and raised Heraclides to the bishopric of Ephesus. That he also consecrated as Bishop of Ephesus that Memnon who is so famous in the history of the third Œcumenical Synod, and also took charge of the filling up of the episcopal sees in Bithynia, we have already seen (see pp. 374, 377, 379). In this way he had practically exercised patriarchal rights over the exarchate of *Asia Proconsularis* and over Bithynia which lay nearer to him. That Atticus, the second successor of S. Chrysostom, procured a special imperial law, according to which he alone had power to officiate at ordinations even beyond the limits of Thrace, we learn from Socrates (vii. 28), from the occasion of the election of a bishop for the metropolitan see of Cyzicus which belonged to the exarchate of Asia. The same Church historian informs us (vii. 48) that in the year 439, after the death of Bishop Firmus of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the clergy of this city petitioned Archbishop Proclus of Constantinople, the predecessor of Flavian, for the

¹ Tillemont, *Mémoires* etc., t. xv. p. 700 sqq.; Quesnel, *Dissert. de Vita* etc. *S. Leonis M.*, ad ann. 452, n. v. sqq.; in Baller. t. ii. p. 521 sqq. Van Espen maintains, therefore (*l.c.* p. 257), that the Synod of Chalcedon accordingly had quite right and good grounds for drawing up its 28th canon.

² Cf. Tillemont, *l.c.* p. 703.

³ Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 28.]

appointment of a new bishop, and that he then elected and consecrated Thalassius, hitherto prefect of Illyria. This is the same Thalassius whom we have so often met. So also Proclus of Constantinople consecrated Basil as Bishop of Ephesus (see above, p. 375). Both facts show that the Bishop of Constantinople had now extended his spiritual jurisdiction over the exarchates of Pontus and Asia as well. Some further facts were mentioned in the sixteenth session which followed (see below).

These extensions of power on the part of the see of Constantinople were certainly to some extent opposed. Particularly it was made a reproach to S. Chrysostom, and it was included among the charges brought against him, that, in opposition to the canons, he had interfered with foreign dioceses. The inhabitants of Cyzicus refused to accept the bishop whom Sisinnius of Constantinople had given to them. (This bishop was the same Proclus who was afterwards Bishop of Constantinople, and whom we have often met, see p. 14.)—But these cases were too much isolated to avail in restraining the efforts of Constantinople, and, in particular, the present occupant of the see, Anatolius, had ventured to appoint Maximus as Bishop of Antioch, in the place of Domnus, who had been deposed at the Robber-Synod, and thus to assume rights of supremacy over this ancient and famous patriarchal see.¹ It was only from love of peace, Pope Leo the Great said (*Ep.* 104), that he had not quashed this illegal election. He knew quite well that Anatolius was bent upon the extension of his power, and therefore, when his legates departed for the East he charged them, in case any of the bishops, taking their ground upon the importance of their episcopal cities, should endeavour to assume new powers to themselves, that they should resist this vehemently (see above, p. 283). At Chalcedon, too, on several occasions, discontent was expressed at the pretensions of Constantinople, thus at the end of the fourth session, when the decree of Anatolius and his *σύνodus ἐνδημοῦσα* in regard to Bishop Photius of Tyre was rescinded (see above, p. 341 f.). Moreover, in the eleventh session the bishops of the Asiatic exarchate urgently entreated that, in

¹ Cf. what Pope Leo the Great said on this point, below, p. 433 ff.

future, the Bishop of Ephesus should no longer be consecrated from Constantinople (see above, p. 375); and at the close of the thirteenth session the desire of Constantinople was not complied with (see above, p. 379).

Notwithstanding this, Anatolius, at the fifteenth session, urged the passing of the 28th canon with success, inasmuch as most of the Greek and Oriental bishops were practically dependent upon him, or did not venture to offer decided opposition, and also because the Emperor supported the views and the plan of the bishop of the imperial residence. From the bishops of the most distinguished sees, with the exception of Rome, Anatolius had no opposition whatever to apprehend; Alexandria and Ephesus were not occupied, Maximus of Antioch was a creature of Anatolius, and even Juvenal of Jerusalem was under obligations to him, as he had assisted him to gain the three provinces of Palestine (see p. 382). The Primate of Heracleian Thrace was absent, and was represented by Lucian of Byzia, a friend of Anatolius; Thalassius of Cæsarea, on the other hand, did not subscribe the 28th canon, and seems, in the short but unintelligible vote which he gave in the sixteenth session, to have held decidedly neither with Constantinople nor with Rome, but rather to have suggested a compromise.¹

A kind of introduction or pioneer to the 28th canon was formed by canons 9 and 17, which already ascribed extraordinary powers to the Bishop of Constantinople, which, however, find their true explanation in this, that the *σύνδοδος ἐνδημούσα* at Constantinople had already for some time in practice formed a court of judgment for the controversies of bishops, to the disregard of their own exarchs. It is also clear that canon 28 falls of itself into two parts. In the first it only repeats and confirms the 3d canon of Constantinople; but in its second part it goes far beyond this, and sanctions that which, particularly since the days of Chrysostom, had been the practice, namely, that outside the diocese of Thrace the previously independent dioceses of Pontus and Asia should be subject to the Bishop of Constantinople. Yet it was the

¹ Cf. Mansi, t. vii. p. 451; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 642; Baller. t. ii. p. 523, nota.

metropolitans alone, and not also the ordinary bishops of these dioceses (as was often the case, see below, pp. 426, 427, note 2, and 432), who had to receive their consecration from Constantinople. The strong opposition which was offered to this canon in the following session by the Roman legates, and afterwards still more by Pope Leo the Great (as we shall shortly see), occasioned its not being received into many copies of the minutes of Chalcedon, or into many not merely Latin, but also Greek and Arabic collections of canons, so that in these only twenty-seven canons were preserved, since the two following numbers also, 29 and 30, but for other reasons, were lacking in them.¹ Thus the Latin collections of Dionysius Exiguus and Isidore, as well as the Prisca, the Greek by John of Antioch (cf. vol. i. p. 450), and the Arabic by Josephus Ægyptius, give only twenty-seven canons of Chalcedon.²

On the 28th canon of Chalcedon, cf. Hergenröther, *Photius*, Bd. i. S. 74 ff., and Moy's *Archiv* etc., Heft 4, S. 142 f.

CAN. 29.

Ἐπίσκοπον εἰς πρεσβυτέρου βαθμὸν φέρειν, ἱεροσυλία ἐστίν. Εἰ δὲ αἰτία τις δικαία ἐκείνους ἀπὸ τῆς πράξεως τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποκινεῖ, οὐδὲ πρεσβυτέρου τόπον κατέχειν ὀφείλουσιν· εἰ δὲ ἐκτός τινος ἐγκλήματος ἀπεκινήθησαν τοῦ ἀξιώματος, πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀξίαν ἐπαναστρέφουσιν.

Ἀνατόλιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως εἶπεν· Οὗτοι οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπισκοπικῆς ἀξίας εἰς τὴν τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου τάξιν κατέβηθαι, εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ εὐλόγων τινῶν αἰτιῶν καταδικάζονται· ἀκότως οὐδὲ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου ἐντὸς ἀξιοὶ τυγχάνουσιν εἶναι· εἰ μὲν δὲ διὰ τινὸς αἰτίας εὐλόγου εἰς τὸν ἥττονα κατέβηθον βαθμὸν, δίκαιοι τυγχάνουσιν, εἴγε ἀνεύθυνοι φανεῖται, τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐπαναλαβεῖν ἀξίαν τε καὶ ἱερωσύνην.

"To degrade a bishop to the position of a presbyter is sacrilege. If, however, there is just cause for such being

¹ Cf. Van Espen, *Commentarius*, l.c. p. 233.

² Cf. Bevereg. *Synodicon*, t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 127; Mansi, t. vi. p. 1169, t. vii. pp. 380, 390, 400; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 611, 612, and 624; Ballerini ed. *Opp. S. Leonis*, t. iii. pp. 238 and 548.

removed from the exercise of the episcopal office, then they shall no longer occupy the place of a priest; if, on the other hand, they are removed from the office without fault, then they shall return again to the episcopal dignity."

Anatolius, the pious bishop of Constantinople, said: "Those of whom it is said that they have been degraded from the episcopal dignity to the position of a priest, if they have been condemned for sufficient reasons, are evidently no longer worthy of the honour of being priests. If, however, they have been degraded to the lower position without sufficient reason, then justice requires that, if they appear guiltless, they shall again receive the dignity and the holy office of the episcopate."

This so-called canon is nothing but a verbal copy of a passage from the minutes of the fourth session in the matter of Photius of Tyre and Eustathius of Berytus.¹ Moreover, it does not possess the peculiar form which we find in all the genuine canons of Chalcedon, and in almost all ecclesiastical canons in general; on the contrary, there adheres to it a portion of the debate, of which it is a fragment, in which Anatolius is introduced as speaking. Besides, it is wanting in all the old Greek, as well as in the Latin collections of canons, and in those of John of Antioch and of Photius, and has only been appended to the twenty-eight genuine canons of Chalcedon from the fact that a later transcriber thought fit to add to the genuine canons the general and important principle contained in the place in question of the fourth session. Accordingly, this so-called canon is certainly an ecclesiastical rule declared at Chalcedon, and in so far a *κανών*, but it was not added as a canon proper to the other twenty-eight by the Synod.²

CAN. 30.

Ἐπειδὴ οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τῆς Αἰγύπτου, οὐχ ὡς μαχόμενοι τῇ καθολικῇ πίστει, ὑπογράψαι τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Λέοντος ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος ἀνεβάλλοντο, ἀλλὰ φάσκοντες, ἔθος εἶναι ἐν τῇ Αἰγυπτιακῇ διοικήσει,

¹ See above, p. 342, and Mansi, t. vii. p. 95; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 443.

² Cf. Van Espen, *Commentar.* etc., p. 233; Bevereg. *l.c.* t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 125; Ballerin. *l.c.* t. iii. p. 771.

παρὰ γνώμην καὶ διατύπωσιν τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου μηδὲν τοιοῦτο ποιεῖν, καὶ ἀξιούσιν ἐνδοθῆναι αὐτοῖς ἄχρι τῆς χειροτονίας τοῦ ἐσομένου τῆς τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων μεγαλοπόλεως ἀρχιεπισκόπου εὐλογον ἡμῖν ἐφάνη καὶ φιλάνθρωπον, ὥστε αὐτοῖς μένουσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ οἰκείου σχήματος ἐν τῇ βασιλευσῇ πόλει ἔνδοσιν παρασχεθῆναι, ἄχρις ἂν χειροτονηθῇ ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, ὅθεν μένοντες ἐπὶ τοῦ οἰκείου σχήματος ἢ ἐγγύας παρέξουσιν, εἰ τοῦτο αὐτοῖς δυνατὸν, ἢ ἐξωμοσίᾳ καταπιστευθήσονται.

"As the bishops of Egypt have hitherto deferred subscribing the letter of the holy Archbishop Leo, not as from opposition to the Catholic faith, but because they say it is the custom to do nothing of this kind in the Egyptian diocese without the consent and order of the Archbishop (of Alexandria), and have asked for delay until the election of the future bishop of Alexandria, we hold it reasonable and in accordance with Christian love that they should be allowed to remain in their present position (that is, without any ecclesiastical penalty being suspended over them) at Constantinople, and wait until the Archbishop of Alexandria is consecrated, so as they either give pledges for their remaining, or take an oath that they will not go away."

This paragraph, like the previous one, is not a proper canon, but a verbal repetition of a proposal made in the fourth session by the imperial commissioners, improved by the legate Paschasinus, and approved by the Synod.¹ Moreover, this so-called canon is not found in the ancient collections, and was probably added to the twenty-eight canons in the same manner and for the same reasons as the preceding.²

SEC. 201. *Sixteenth and last Session, November 1, 451.*

As already remarked, the 28th canon gave occasion for the holding of a new session, the sixteenth, which took place on the 1st of November 451.³ The Greek manuscripts, it is true,

¹ See above, p. 334, and Mansi, t. vii. p. 59; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 419.

² Cf. the above, and Bevereg. *l.c.* t. i. p. 148, and t. ii. *Annotat.* p. 125.

³ The Acts are found in Mansi, t. vii. pp. 423-454; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 628-644. German abridgment in Fuchs, *Biblioth. der Kirchenvers.* Bd. iv. S. 510 ff.

give another date (v. Kal. Nov.), but from the minutes of the session, particularly from the words of the papal legate, it unmistakeably comes out that it was solemnized one day later than that (fourteenth) session respecting Bishop Sabinian of Perrha etc., after the close of which the papal legates had departed (p. 383), while the other members remained to draw up the twenty-eight canons.¹

In the sixteenth session the papal legates first of all asked permission to be allowed to make a statement; and after the imperial commissioners, of whom again only Anatolius, Palladius, and Vincomalus were present, gave their consent, Paschasinus spoke as follows:—

“The Emperors have not merely shown anxiety for the faith, they have besides had a care that the controversies among the bishops, the schisms and offences, should cease. Yesterday, however, after your highnesses (the imperial commissioners) and our insignificance had departed, something was decreed, which in our view is contrary to the canons and to ecclesiastical order. We request that this be now read.”

The commissioners immediately ordered that this should be done, and Archdeacon Aetius of Constantinople remarked that it was customary in Synods that, after the principal subjects were discharged, anything else that was necessary might be discussed and established. Now, the Church of Constantinople had another subject needing to be settled, and the Roman legates had been requested to take part in the transactions relating to it, but they had refused to do so, declaring that they had no commission for this. The imperial commissioners, on the contrary, had commanded the Synod to take the matter into their consideration. After their departure all the bishops had risen and had demanded this discussion, which had taken place, not secretly or stealthily, but in an orderly and canonical manner. The consistorial secretary, Beronicianus, then read the 28th canon, which was subscribed by about two hundred bishops, and by some also in the name of several colleagues.² Of the members of the Synod who had hitherto appeared in the minutes, only about one half had

¹ Cf. the marginal note in Mansi, t. vii. p. 423, and also under note 6.

² Mansi, t. vii. p. 429 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 627 sqq.

subscribed, and, in particular, the Exarch Thalassius of Caesarea was wanting, although he stood in high favour at Constantinople, and had been raised to the episcopate, as we know, by Proclus. Further were wanting Anastasius of Thessalonica, Eusebius of Ancyra, Peter of Corinth, Eunomius of Nicomedia, Julian of Cos, Olympius of Constantia, Onesiphorus of Iconium, and other highly distinguished metropolitans and bishops, particularly the Illyrians.

After the reading was finished, the legate Lucentius gave expression to the suspicion that many bishops had been tricked or forced into subscribing the canons which had been mentioned, and which were hitherto unknown (*non conscriptis*). As he speaks in the plural of canons, he shows that it was not the 28th canon alone which was drawn up in the fifteenth session. His expressions, too, are differently given in the Greek text from those in the Latin translation, and Mansi suggests, in a marginal note, that the latter was derived from a better text. It is not quite clear what Lucentius meant by the expression *NON CONSCRIPTIS canonibus subscribere*. In the Greek text there is nothing corresponding to the *non conscriptis*. As soon as his expression was interpreted by Beronicianus in Greek, the bishops exclaimed: "No one was forced." But Lucentius continued: "Besides, it is clear that the ordinances of the 318 bishops at Nicæa have been set aside, and that those of the 150 have been followed, which have not been received into the number of the synodal canons (and which were put forth only eighty years ago).¹ If the bishops of Constantinople have, since that time, exercised these privileges, why are they now demanded? They have, however, not possessed them in accordance with the canons." Aetius, Archdeacon of Constantinople, wished that the papal legates, if they had any instructions on this point, should communicate them, and the third of them, the presbyter Boniface, now read from a document (see above, p. 283) the words: "The decision of the holy fathers (at Nicæa) you must not allow to be violated, and you must in all ways preserve and defend my prerogative in your person.

¹ The words in parentheses are only in the Latin translation, which, as we have observed, in several places is derived from a better Greek text than the present.

And if any, taking their stand on the importance of their cities, should endeavour to arrogate anything to themselves, you must resist this with all decision."¹

The imperial commissioners requested both parties to bring forward the ecclesiastical laws upon which they based their position. The legate Paschasinus then read from his copy the 6th Nicene canon in connection with the 7th, in a form which departs from the genuine Greek text (vol. i. p. 388), in one point in a very remarkable manner (since it ascribes the primacy to the bishop of Rome, cf. vol. i. p. 401 f.); but in that part with respect to which there is here question, namely, in reference to the rights of Alexandria and Antioch, —in opposition to Constantinople,—it was quite correct.

According to the synodal Acts, as we now possess them, the consistorial secretary, Constantine, next read from a Greek manuscript, which Archdeacon Aetius gave him, the same 6th Nicene canon, and immediately afterwards the first three canons of the second Œcumenical Synod.² The Ballerini have, however, made it probable³ that a later insertion is here before us, and that a transcriber, when he remarked the difference between the Greek text of the 6th Nicene canon and the Latin text of the legates, had inserted the former for comparison, and that at Chalcedon the consistorial secretary, Constantine, had read from the manuscript of Aetius only the first three canons of Constantinople, since only these could be adduced *for* the object of the Synod, whilst the 6th canon of Nicæa had pronounced *against* it, that is, against the raising of the rank of the see of Constantinople.

This suggestion the Ballerini have further supported by an old Latin version of the passage relating to the sixteenth session, and have also pointed out that the Synod of Constantinople could hardly have been designated as *δευτέρα σύνοδος*, as it is called in the contested passages.⁴

We add further: If the Greek text of the 6th Nicene

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 442 sq. ; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 635 sqq.

² Mansi, t. vii. p. 443 ; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 638.

³ In their edition of the works of Leo the Great, t. iii. p. xxxvii. sqq.

⁴ We have already seen (vol. ii. p. 372) that at the Robber-Synod the Nicene was designated as the first, and the Ephesine as *δευτέρα σύνοδος*, passing over that of Constantinople.

canon had been opposed at Chalcedon to the corrupt Latin text which the legates read, on purpose and in order to prove its corruption, it certainly was very remarkable that not the least remark was made on the relation of the two texts. Without indicating the slightest doubt respecting the Latin text, the imperial commissioners requested the bishops of Pontus and Asia, who had subscribed the 28th canon of Chalcedon, to make a solemn declaration whether they had done so freely, that is, whether they had voluntarily subjected themselves to the see of Constantinople, and Diogenes of Cyzicus, Florentius of Sardis, Romanus of Myra, Calogerus of Claudio-polis, Seleucus of Amasia, Eleutherius of Chalcedon, Peter of Gangra, Nunechius of Laodicea, Marinianus of Synnada, Pergamius of Antioch in Pisidia, Critonianus of Aphrodisias, Eusebius of Dorylæum, Antiochus of Sinope, and others asserted, each of those mentioned by name in a short speech, that they had subscribed willingly and freely. Seleucus of Amasia and Peter of Gangra, in particular, declared that three of their predecessors had already been ordained from Constantinople; and Eusebius of Dorylæum asserted, that "when he had been at Rome (see above, p. 271), he had read to the Pope the canon of Constantinople in question, and he had accepted it."—That his reference here was at least inexact there is no doubt; for Pope Leo asserts too frequently that he had never assented to that canon, and had never received it among the approved laws of the Church. It is, however, possible, that when Eusebius read it to him he made no unfavourable remark at the moment, and the other may have misinterpreted his silence.

Those bishops of Asia and Pontus who had *not* signed the 28th canon were next called upon to express their opinion. Eusebius of Ancyra replied, and alleged, with reference to facts, that he had never put himself forward to undertake ordinations, but that he had been repeatedly requested by the inhabitants of Gangra to undertake one, and that his predecessors, too, had ordained several bishops of Gangra. At the same time, he admitted that Proclus of Constantinople had also consecrated a bishop for Gangra, and further, that the present bishop of that city, Peter, had been ordained at Con-

stantinople, because he (Eusebius) had withdrawn his claim to ordain. By this he had shown that he had no wish to usurp the power of consecrating other bishops. Further, he only wished that every ordination might be gratuitous, for he had himself been obliged, on entering upon his office, to take over a great debt which had come down from the consecration of his predecessor.—On the reply of Philip, a priest of Constantinople, that these payments had now been done away with at Constantinople by Anatolius, Eusebius of Ancyra remarked that “Anatolius might die, and then another practice might be again introduced;” and to a further question, added the avowal that he had himself been ordained by Proclus of Constantinople. He said “unfortunately,” because he regretted that he had received the episcopal dignity.¹ The special question, why he had not subscribed the 28th canon, he did not answer at all; but it is clear from his speech that he did not contest the right of Constantinople to confer ordination so extensively, but would not positively approve of it.

Thalassius, Exarch of Pontus, spoke next, but did not explain even by one syllable why he had not subscribed the 28th canon, but spoke only the few words, that “it was best to meet with Anatolius and arrange the matter.” He apparently meant to say that the relation of the bishops of Pontus and Asia to the see of Constantinople should be arranged by agreement.

Without agreeing to this suggestion, the imperial commissioners summed up: “From all that has been discussed and brought forward from every side, we perceive that the first right of all (τὸ πᾶντων τὰ πρωτεῖα) and the chief rank of honour (καὶ τὴν ἐξαιρέτον τιμὴν) is to be accorded to the Archbishop of Old Rome, but that the Archbishop of New Rome must enjoy the same prerogatives of honour (τῶν αὐτῶν πρεσβείων τῆς τιμῆς), and have the right to ordain the metropolitans in the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, in this manner, that each of them should be either unanimously or by a plurality of votes elected by the clergy of the metropolis and the most distinguished men of the city and the bishops of the province, and should be presented to the Archbishop of

¹ Cf. Tillemont, t. xv. p. 284.

Constantinople, so that he, if he so willed, should summon him to Constantinople and there consecrate him, or at his discretion should leave the consecration to the bishops of the eparchy. The bishops of the common towns, however, should be consecrated by all the bishops of the eparchy, or at least by the majority of them, since the metropolitan by the old canons has a right to this, without the Archbishop of Constantinople having to take part in these ordinations.¹ So we understand the matter. The Synod shall now say whether this is its opinion." The bishops exclaimed: "This is the right view; so say we all; we all so will it; that is the right judgment which is decreed; this shall prevail; we pray dismiss us. Prosperity to the Emperors! Dismiss us; we all abide by this declaration; we all say this."

The papal legate Lucentius, on the contrary, declared: "The apostolic see has ordered that everything (at the Synod) shall be discussed in our presence. If, then, anything contrary to the canons was done yesterday in our absence, we pray your highnesses (the commissioners) to annul it. If not, yet our protest must be entered in these Acts, so that we may know what we have to inform the apostolic bishop who presides over the whole Church, so that he may take some resolution upon the wrong done to his own see, or upon the violation of the canons."—These words were received into the minutes, and the commissioners closed the business with the words: "What we previously proposed, the whole Synod has agreed to;" that is, the prerogative assigned to the Church of Constantinople is, in spite of the opposition of the Roman legate, decreed by the Synod.²

Thus ended the Council of Chalcedon, after it had lasted three weeks. What was the subsequent attitude of Rome towards it we shall see hereafter.

¹ Hitherto the Archbishop of Constantinople had also consecrated ordinary bishops, who were under other metropolitans, as the example of Basilinopolis etc. (see above, p. 379) shows, and as is expressly asserted by Anatolius of Constantinople (see below, p. 432). The see of Constantinople had therefore to give up the smaller, in order the more securely to preserve the greater (the consecration of metropolitans to so great an extent).

² Mansi, t. vii. pp. 446-454; Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 639-643.

SEC. 202. *The Title: Œcumenical Patriarch.*

Pope Gregory the Great and Leo IX. refer to the fact that the Synod of Chalcedon offered Pope Leo I. the title of "Œcumenical Patriarch," but that he, like all his successors, refused this unsuitable designation.¹ This statement probably arose in the following manner. The papal legates subscribed: *Vicarii apostolici universalis ecclesiæ Papæ*. The Greeks translated this by τῆς οἰκουµενικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπου² = *Universæ ecclesiæ episcopus*. Leo was further, at the third session of Chalcedon, in the superscriptions of the four memorials of the Alexandrians, Theodore, Ischyrion, Sophronius, and Athanasius (against Dioscurus), repeatedly called "Œcumenical Archbishop and Patriarch of Great Rome."³ Similarly, almost a hundred years later, Pope Agapetus was entitled by the Orientals Œcumenical Patriarch.⁴ There is, however, no trace in the Acts of the Synod of Chalcedon, or in the letters of Leo, that they offered him in any of their transactions the title in question, or that he declined it.

SEC. 203. *Synodal Letter to the Pope. He is asked to confirm the Decrees.*

In the collections of the Acts of Councils there follows after the minutes of the sixteen sessions a memorial which the Council of Chalcedon presented to the Emperor Marcian. As, however, this evidently belongs to an earlier period, we have already spoken of it (see p. 351 f.). On the other hand, a letter of our Synod to Pope Leo belongs to its close, and is preserved to us in the Greek original, and in the Latin translation of the deacon Rusticus (see p. 291).⁵ It begins with the words

¹ Gregor. M. *Lib.* iv. *Epist.* 32 and 36, and *Lib.* vii. *Epist.* 30; Hardouin, t. vi. p. 932.

² Hardouin, t. i. p. 465 sq.; Mansi, t. vii. p. 136.

³ Hardouin, t. ii. pp. 321, 325, 332, 336; Mansi, t. vi. pp. 1005, 1012, 1021, 1029.

⁴ Hardouin, t. ii. p. 1203; Mansi, t. viii. p. 895.

⁵ Mansi, t. vi. p. 147 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 655 sqq. Baller. ed. *Operum S. Leonis*, t. i. p. 1087 (No. 98 in the collection of Leo's letters). A still older Latin translation of this letter, almost contemporaneous with the Synod of Chalcedon, with the subscription of about seventy bishops, is in Ballerini, *l.c.* p. 1099; Mansi, t. vi. p. 155.

of the Psalmist in Ps. cxxv. [cxxvi.]: "Our mouth was filled with laughter, and our tongue with joy." The reason of this joy, they said, was the confirmation of the faith, which had been preserved by Leo, and the blissful contents of which had been transmitted by him as interpreter of the voice of Peter. Him (the Pope) the bishops at Chalcedon had taken as their guide, in order to show to the sons of the Church the inheritance of the truth. His letter had been for them a spiritual, imperial banquet, and they believed they had had the heavenly Bridegroom present at it in the midst of them. As the head over the members, so had Leo by his representatives had the predominance (hegemony) among them. The faithful Emperors, however, had, *πρὸς εὐκοσμίαν*, i.e. in order that everything might proceed in the most orderly manner, had the presidency (compare above, p. 297), and had wished that the fabric of dogmas should be renovated. The Synod then speaks of the "wild beast Dioscurus" and his crimes, particularly of his having in his madness attacked even him who was *by the Saviour appointed keeper of the divine vineyard* (the Pope), and having dared to excommunicate him whose vocation it was to unite the body of the Church. The Synod had inflicted meet punishment upon him because he had not repented and appeared in answer to their exhortation. All their other business had been prosperously conducted by God's grace and through S. Euphemia, who had crowned the assembly held in her bridal chamber, and had transmitted its doctrinal decree as her own to her Bridegroom Christ by the hand of the Emperor and the Empress. Then, passing on to that which was less agreeable, the Synod said: "We also make known to thee that we have decreed something else in the interest of peace and order in Church matters, and for the confirmation of the ecclesiastical statutes, knowing that your holiness will also approve and confirm (*βεβαιοῦν*) this. We have, in fact, confirmed the long-existing custom, by which the Bishop of Constantinople ordains the metropolitans of the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thracia, not so much in order to give a prerogative to the see of Constantinople, but rather to secure the peace of the metropolitan cities, because in these at the decease of a bishop factions often broke out, as your holiness yourself

knows, and particularly for the sake of Ephesus, which caused us much trouble (by the quarrel between Stephen and Bassian, see above, p. 370 f. and p. 375 f.). We have also confirmed the canon of the Synod of the 150 fathers, by which the second rank is assigned to the see of Constantinople, immediately after thy holy and apostolic see. We have done it with confidence, because you have so often allowed the apostolic ray which shines by you to appear to the Church of Constantinople, and because you are accustomed ungrudgingly to enrich those who belong to you by allowing them participation in your own possessions. Be pleased, therefore, to embrace (*περιτρίξασθαι*) this decree as though it were thine own, most holy and most blessed father. Thy legates have strongly opposed it, probably because they thought that this good regulation, like the declaration of the faith, should proceed from thyself. But we were of opinion that it belonged to the Œcumenical Synod to confirm its prerogatives to the imperial city in accordance with the wish of the Emperor, assuming that, when thou hadst heard it, thou wouldst regard it as thine own act. For all that the sons have done, which is good, conduces to the honour of the fathers. We pray thee, honour our decree also by thine assent (*παρακαλοῦμεν τοῖνυν, τίμησον καὶ ταῖς σαῖς ψήφοις τὴν κρίσιν*); and as we have assented to thy good (doctrinal) decree, so may thy loftiness accomplish that which is meet towards the sons. This will also please the Emperors, who have sanctioned thy judgment in the faith as law; and the see of Constantinople may well receive a reward for the zeal with which it united itself with thee in the matter of religion. In order to show that we have done nothing from favour or dislike towards any one, we have brought the whole contents of what we have done to thy knowledge, and have communicated it to thee for confirmation and assent (*βεβαίωσιν τε καὶ συγκατάθεσιν*)."

This synodal letter was probably composed by Bishop Anatolius of Constantinople, and the papal legates took it with them along with the synodal Acts, when, soon after the last session, they departed for Rome.¹ About a month later the Emperor Marcian and Archbishop Anatolius thought good

¹ Cf. Ballerini, *l.c.* t. i. p. 1123, nota 4.

at the same time to address new letters to Pope Leo, and sent Bishop Lucian of Byzia and the deacon Basil with them to Rome. The two letters are numbered in the collection of Leo's Epistles 100 and 101. That of Anatolius bears no date, but in the Emperor's the 18th of December 451 is given. Anatolius explains, with abundant politeness, at the very beginning of his letter, that all that had taken place at the Synod must necessarily have been brought to the knowledge of the Pope, and that therefore he now forwarded by Bishop Lucian and deacon Basil those documents which the papal legates had not taken with them at their departure. The Pope would certainly agree to the sentence which had been pronounced upon Dioscurus, whose condemnation had been the first matter of importance before the Synod. As their second work, they had endeavoured, in accordance with the will of the Emperor, by the assistance of the papal legates, and under the protection of S. Euphemia, to draw up an unanimous declaration of the faith, and had, in fact, succeeded in doing so in accordance with the holy letter of the Pope, and had laid it upon the holy altar. They had, besides, had something else to care for, and it had been the wish of the Emperor and Empress, as well as of the imperial commissioners and the senate, that the see of the residence city of Constantinople should receive an increase in honour by the assent of the Synod to the canon (3) of the 150 fathers at Constantinople. This had been done in the confidence that his holiness regarded the honour of the see of Constantinople as his own, since the apostolic throne had from early times cared for the throne of Constantinople, and had ungrudgingly imparted to it of its own. As there was no doubt that his holiness and his Church possessed still higher precedence (*τιμὴ*), the Synod willingly confirmed the canon of the 150 fathers, that the bishop of Constantinople should have the next rank after the Roman bishop, since his city is New Rome, and they further decreed that he should have to consecrate the metropolitans of the dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, but not the other bishops of those parts, a decree by which the Bishop of Constantinople had lost again several rights of ordination which he had exercised for sixty or seventy years. The papal legates, not rightly understanding

Leo's intention, had unfortunately protested against this decree, although it had been drawn up in accordance with the will of the Emperor, and thus had thrown all into confusion, and had wronged him (Anatolius) and his Church, while he had constantly done all for the honour of Leo and his legates. From reverence for the Pope, the Synod and himself as well had transmitted that decree (τύπος, *i.e.* the 28th canon) to him for his approval and confirmation (συναινέσις καὶ βεβαίωσις), and he adjured him to give this, for the apostolic throne was the father of that of Constantinople, and so forth.¹

The letter was shorter which was addressed to Pope Leo by the Emperor Marcian, also in the name of his Western colleague Valentinian III. (in official style). He is glad that the true faith has received its expression, and this in accordance with the doctrinal letter of Leo to Flavian, and he asks the Pope to rejoice with them. He hopes that he will also give his assent to the decree in reference to the see of Constantinople.²

SEC. 204. *Answer of the Pope. He rejects the 28th Canon.*

Pope Leo was not the man to let himself be caught by fine words.³ In his answer to the Emperor, of the 22d May 452,

¹ Among the letters of Leo, No. 101, in Baller. t. i. p. 1122 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 171 sqq.

² No. 100 among the letters of Leo, in Baller. *l.c.* pp. 1112 and 1115 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 166 sqq. Cf. note 1 in Baller. *l.c.* p. 1111, and note 1 in Mansi, *l.c.* p. 166.

³ That Leo rejected the 28th canon of Chalcedon not from the fear that the Patriarch of Constantinople might encroach upon his own importance, but from a sense of duty to preserve the regulation of Nicaea, and the old ecclesiastical rights, is shown by the Ballerini, in opposition to Quesnel, in their edition of the works of Leo, t. ii. p. 1529. Arendt (in his monograph on Leo the Great) shows that, on the one hand, the Synod of Chalcedon had reason for elevating the importance of the see of Constantinople; but, on the other side, that the Pope, from his point of view, had a right and even a duty to oppose this attempt. He says (S. 316-318): "The bitter experiences of recent times had sufficiently taught how dangerous to the peace of the Church had become the predominating power which the Patriarch of Alexandria possessed in the East. The newly arisen monasticism had attained to great influence in Egypt, was almost entirely dependent upon him, and might easily, as Theophilus and Dioscurus proved, be employed by him for ambitious objects and to the detriment of the general liberty of the Church. The Synod seems now to have proceeded from the idea that this incongruity would best be remedied by conceding prerogatives to the

he also expresses his joy at the happy termination of the Synod, particularly at this, that, with the exception of the heretical leaders, all the bishops had been unanimous, and he commends the zeal which the Emperor had displayed for this cause. But he is surprised, he says, and sorry that, after accomplishing the special object of the Synod, the newly established peace of the Church should again be invaded by

see of Constantinople, such as would put it in a position to form a counterpoise to Alexandria. Besides, Anatolius, as was later shown, was not free from ambitious designs, and it might be ascribed as much to his efforts with the Emperor as to the circumstances just explained, that these prerogatives were allowed to him. From this point of view the proceedings of the Council appear not only justified, but in more than one respect perhaps necessary. But this could not be the point of view from which the Pope was obliged to judge of what had been done. In the consciousness, which was deeply and distinctly founded in Leo, that he was bound by virtue of his office to care for the welfare of the Church in general, he was obliged to find a cause and a duty for considering those decrees not in their local necessity and utility, but in their relation to the whole of the Church, and in how far they might advantage or injure these interests and their development for the future. Thus viewed, they must appear in quite a different light. It was clear that by such a prerogative being conferred upon the see of Constantinople it must obtain predominance in the East, as had previously been the case with that of Alexandria; and from the greater political importance of the Bishop of New Rome an abuse of such prerogative might inflict greater injury on the Church at large. It could not be doubted that the prerogative once obtained, from the position of circumstances, would soon extend over the whole of the East, and great danger might easily grow out of this, not only to the liberty and independence of the other greater and small ecclesiastical organisms, but to the Church in its greater divisions of East and West. The possibility of a separation had come much nearer when the leading of the East was placed in the hand of one bishop. It was therefore no selfish or jealous interest, but the care for the whole from a higher point of view, which laid upon him the duty of opposing this canon. Whatever could be said in its favour from a momentary and local utility could not be compared with that. The relation of the Pope to the Christian world imposed upon him the duty to look further, and to include the *future* of the Church in his cares, and especially then, when even a Council had acted only in accordance with the subordinate necessities of the moment, and had regarded the circumstances of a part more than the interest of the whole. How correct the Pope's view was, is shown, alas! incontestably by history in the division of the Oriental Church from that of the West, which was in great measure the result of a desire for power founded upon a predominance, the origin of which is perhaps to be sought in these prerogatives now assigned to the Bishop of Constantinople. Besides, by the promulgation of this canon there were evident violations of rights brought about, particularly in reference to the jurisdiction of the metropolitans of Ephesus and Cæsarea, whose independence rested upon very valid ecclesiastical decrees of earlier times."

ambition. Anatolius had been right in breaking loose from the error of those who had ordained him (Dioscurus), and in passing over to the Catholic faith. Out of regard for the Emperor, he (the Pope) had from the beginning exercised not justice, but gentleness towards Anatolius, and this should have made him modest rather than proud. But even if he were a highly meritorious man, and had been appointed quite regularly, still his violation of the canons could not be excused, and, in truth, Anatolius did as much harm to his position as he endeavoured improperly to add to its importance. "May Constantinople," proceeds Leo, "have the honour which belongs to it, and under God's protection long enjoy thy government. But secular affairs are one thing, and the divine another (*i.e.* the secular and the ecclesiastical arrangements are distinct from each other, cf. above, p. 412 f.), and there is no other firm foundation but upon the Rock which the Lord laid as a foundation-stone. To the before-named (Anatolius) it ought to suffice that, with the help of thy piety and by my consent, he has received the bishopric of so great a city. He should not esteem lightly the imperial city; but he cannot make it an *apostolic* see; nor must he hope to increase by injury done to others, for the privileges of the Churches, which are defined by the canons of the holy fathers, and fixed by the decrees of the venerable Synod of Nicæa, must be destroyed by no injustice and altered by no innovation. On this point I must, by the help of Christ, persistently discharge my duties, because this care (*dispensatio*, *i.e.* the guarding of the canons) is committed to me (by God), and it would involve me in blame if the regulations drawn up, under the teaching of the Holy Spirit, at Nicæa (on the rank of the Churches) were violated with my consent,—be that far from me,—and if the wish of one brother (Anatolius) had more weight with me than the common good of the whole house of God. I pray therefore . . . thy glorious Grace not to confirm the unrighteous attempts of Anatolius, which are dangerous to Christian unity and peace, and that thou wilt wholesomely restrain his mischievous desire if he persists in it. . . . Do what seems fitting to thy Christian and imperial piety, that the before-named bishop may obey the ordinances of the fathers, may

have regard to peace, and not believe that it is allowed to him, in opposition to all precedents and canons, to consecrate a bishop for Antioch. Only from love of peace and for the restoration of the unity of the faith, I have abstained from annulling this ordination. Henceforth let him abstain from violating the ecclesiastical rules, so that he may not cut himself off from the Church."¹

On the same day Pope Leo wrote also to the Empress Pulcheria: "It would have been best if the Synod had been contented with that which was its special object, and had added nothing which is contrary to the good result of that object (the peace of the Church). My brother and fellow-bishop Anatolius, not considering that he obtained his bishopric only through your beneficence and through the consent of my favour, has not been contented with what he has obtained, but has allowed himself to be inflamed by the desire for excessive honour, and has thought to satisfy this by extorting from several the required subscription. . . . By this means the regulations of the Nicene Synod are violated, whilst it is only by all the bishops faithfully observing these that peace can continue among the Churches. This was also represented by my legates at the Synod to those who grow up from being little, and wish to pass over from being small to be the greatest.² But what does the Bishop of Constantinople wish more than he has already? Or what will satisfy him, since the glory and the fame of so great a city do not suffice him? It shows pride and a want of moderation when one wishes to overstep his bounds, and to violate the rights of others which have been confirmed by antiquity. In order that the importance of a single see may increase, the primacies of so many metropolitans (*tot metropolitanorum primatus*) must be invaded, and provinces which were at peace and regulated by the Nicene laws must be disturbed. In order to do away with the decrees of the fathers (of Nicæa), an appeal is made to the decree of some bishops (the 150 at Constantinople in 381), to which so long a course of years has given no effect. It must now be sixty years since this privilege was conceded to the Bishops

¹ Leonis *Ep.* 104, in Baller. *Lc.* t. i. p. 1143 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 187 sqq.

² Byzantium was formerly only a suffragan see.

of Constantinople; but whether the one or the other attempted to gain it, none succeeded. Anatolius should consider whose successor he is, and imitate Flavian in faith, in modesty, in humility. . . . As for the resolution of the bishops, which is contrary to the Nicene decree (*i.e.* the 28th canon of Chalcedon, and the resolution of the sixteenth session), in union with the piety of your faith I declare it to be invalid, and annul it by the authority of the holy Apostle Peter. You will, however, restrain my brother Bishop Anatolius within the limits which are wholesome for him."¹

The third letter of the same date (May 22, 452) was addressed by Pope Leo to Anatolius himself, and first of all he commends him for having abandoned the error of those who had ordained him, and acceded to the Catholic faith. But the true Christian, he proceeds, must be free not only from heresy, but from craving (for that which is unlawful), and from pride, which was the cause of the first sin. But Anatolius, although first the beginning of his pontificate, and then his consecrating a Bishop of Antioch had been irregular, had unfortunately gone so far astray that he had endeavoured to abolish the regulations of Nicæa, and thought that the fit time had come to deprive the sees of Alexandria and Antioch of their rank, and in the districts subject to Constantinople to deprive all the metropolitans of their honour. He had abused for the ends of his own ambition the holy Synod which had been assembled by the Emperor only for the extinction of heresy and for the confirmation of the faith, as if that which a number of bishops unrighteously decreed were inviolate, and as if the canons of Nicæa, which had been inspired by the Holy Ghost, could be partially abolished. Even a Synod so numerous must not compare itself with the 318 fathers at Nicæa, and still less prefer itself to them; on the contrary, everything was invalid which had been established even by so great a Synod in contradiction to the Nicene Council. . . . This pride, which had misled the bishops who were assembled only for the question of the faith, partly by corruption, partly by intimidation (into passing the 28th canon), went even to the confusion of the whole Church, for which reason the papal legates had

¹ Leonis *Ep.* 105, in Baller. *l.c.* t. i. p. 1154 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 195 sqq.

properly entered their protest. He (the Pope) could not possibly give his consent, for the Nicene canons were valid to the end of time, and whatever was in opposition to them must without delay be annulled. Anatolius could not appeal to the resolution which, as he said, had been drawn up by some bishops sixty years ago, for this had never been sent to the Pope, and had been invalid from the beginning. . . . The rights of the provincial primacies (*provincialium jura primatum*) must not be disturbed,¹ nor the metropolitans robbed of their ancient privileges,² nor the see of Alexandria deprived of the dignity which it received on account of Mark the disciple of Peter, notwithstanding the apostasy of Dioscurus; nor Antioch, where Peter preached, and where the name of *Christian* first arose, be lowered from its third rank.³ The episcopal sees were one thing, the (secular) presidents another, and each must preserve his honour inviolate. Anatolius should therefore lay aside his ambition, apply himself to the spirit of love, and be mindful of the words (Apoc. iii. 11): *Tene quod habes, ne alius accipiat coronam tuam*; for if he aspired after that which was not allowed, he would by the judgment of the Church be deprived of that which he possessed.⁴

Finally, Leo wrote on the same day also to Bishop Julian of Cos, and blamed him for having, in a letter to the Pope, spoken in favour of the assumption of Anatolius, and recommended him to confirm it.⁵

SEC. 205. *Imperial Edicts in favour of the Synod of Chalcedon, and against the Monophysites.*

In the meantime the Emperor Marcian, in his own name

¹ That is, the exarchates of Pontus etc., must not be placed under Constantinople.

² By the regulation that they must in future receive their consecration in Constantinople.

³ Leo speaks accordingly of a double wrong, contained in the 23th canon: (1) that it withdraws from the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch the rank which belongs to them; and (2) that it destroys the independence of the exarchates of Pontus etc. Compare the remarks of Quesnel on this letter, in Baller. *l.c.* t. ii. p. 1491.

⁴ Leonis *Ep.* 106, in Baller. t. i. p. 1158 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 198 sqq.

⁵ Leonis *Ep.* 107, in Baller. *l.c.* t. i. p. 1171; Mansi, t. vi. p. 207.

and in that of his co-Emperor, on the 7th of February 452, had put forth an edict, dated from Constantinople, for the observance of the doctrinal decree of Chalcedon. Its contents are as follows: "That which has been so greatly and universally desired is at last accomplished. The controversy respecting orthodoxy is over, and unity of opinion is restored among the nations. The bishops, assembled in Chalcedon at my command from various exarchies, have taught with exactness in a doctrinal decree what is to be maintained in respect to religion. All unholy controversy must now cease, as he is certainly impious and sacrilegious who, after the declaration made by so many bishops, thinks that there still remains something for his own judgment to examine. For it is evidently a sign of extreme folly when a man seeks for a deceptive light in broad day. He who, after discovery has been made of the truth, still inquires after something else, seeks for falsehood. No cleric, no soldier, and generally no one, in whatever position he may be, must venture publicly to dispute concerning the faith, seeking to produce confusion, and to find pretexts for false doctrines. For it is an insult to the holy Synod to subject that which it has decreed and fundamentally established to new examinations and public disputes, since that which was recently defined concerning the Christian faith is in accordance with the doctrine of the 318 fathers and the regulation of the 150 fathers. The punishment for the transgressors of this law shall not be delayed, since they are not only opponents of the lawfully established faith, but also by their contentions betray the holy mysteries to Jews and heathen. If a cleric ventures openly to dispute respecting religion, he shall be struck out of the catalogue of the clergy, the soldier shall be deprived of his belt, other persons shall be removed from the residence city, and shall have suitable punishments inflicted upon them, according to the pleasure of the courts of justice," and so forth.¹

In a second edict, of the 13th of March 452, the Emperor Marcian set forth with all brevity that the Synod, in agreement with the declarations of faith of the Councils of Nicæa,

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 475 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 659; Fuchs, *Biblioth. der Kirchenvers.* Bd. iv. S. 526.

Constantinople, and Ephesus, had rejected the heresy of Eutyches, and had confirmed the faith. He had, by his previous edict (that which has just been mentioned), confirmed this venerable Synod, and had forbidden all disputation on the faith for the future. He had, however, learnt that nevertheless there were some who in their folly did not cease publicly to contend on the subject of religion before the people. They had deserved to have immediately inflicted upon them the punishments threatened; but since God had special pleasure in mercy, he would put off their punishment, and would again send forth a prohibition of such disputations on the subject of religion. If any one should now still transgress this prohibition, he should, without further indulgence, be subjected to punishment.¹

In a third edict, of the 6th of July 452, the Emperor Marcian annulled the decree which his predecessor, Theodosius II., led astray by others, had put forth after the Robber-Synod against Flavian, Eusebius of Dorylaeum, and Theodoret of Cyrus.² Still more important is his fourth decree, of the 28th of July 452, according to which the Eutychians as well as the Apollinarians are forbidden to have any clergy, and if they should nevertheless venture to appoint such, both those who undertook the consecration of them and those who were consecrated were to be punished with confiscation of their goods and banishment for life. Moreover, they were not allowed to hold any assemblies whatever, or to build any monasteries, or to live together in monasteries. The places in which they assembled should be confiscated if the assembly took place with the knowledge of the proprietor; but if not, then he who had hired the building (at the request of the heretics) should be beaten and punished with confiscation of property and banishment. Further, the Eutychians should be incapable of inheriting anything left by will, or of appointing those who shared in their heresy as their heirs; nor should they be allowed to be received into the army, except among the auxiliaries (*cohortalitia*) or the boundary troops. If any of them should already be in the army, or should after entering

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 478 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 662.

² Mansi, t. vii. p. 498 sqq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 675.

it fall into this error, he should be expelled, and confined to his home. Those Eutychians, moreover, who had previously been clergy of the orthodox faith, and also the monks who inhabited the stable of Eutyches, which did not deserve the name of a monastery, should be driven entirely from the soil of the Roman Empire, as had been ordered by older laws in regard to the Manichæans. Further, the writings of the Eutychians were to be burnt, and those who composed and circulated such should be punished with confiscation of goods and banishment, and all instruction in this heresy should be most rigorously punished. Finally, all governors in the provinces, their officials, and the judges in the cities, if they should be negligent in carrying out this law, were threatened, as despisers of religion and the laws, with a penalty of ten pounds of gold.¹

At the same time Eutyches and Dioscurus were condemned to banishment. The former, however, who was greatly advanced in years at the outbreak of the controversies, seems to have died at this very time, whilst Dioscurus lived in banishment until the year 454 at Gangra in Paphlagonia.

SEC. 206. *Further Correspondence between Rome and Constantinople. Leo confirms the Doctrinal Decree of Chalcedon.*

But with all this the Monophysite heresy was in no way extinguished; on the contrary, in some provinces, particularly in Palestine and Egypt, as we shall see later on, it made considerable progress; and as the erroneous and misleading report went abroad in the Greek Empire, about the middle or in the second half of the year 452, that Pope Leo had in his letters already mentioned (Nos. 104–108) repudiated the decrees of Chalcedon, this gave again a powerful impulse to the heresy, and encouraged various acts of violence. The Emperor Marcian therefore, in a letter of the 15th of February 453, earnestly urged upon the Pope not to delay in putting forth his confirmation (*βεβαιῶσθαι*) of the Synod of Chalcedon in a letter destined for publication in the churches, so that no one should longer doubt of his agreement, and thereby be able to

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 502 sq.; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 675 sqq.

excuse his own perversity.¹ One thing the Pope had indeed done excellently, namely, his guarding the ecclesiastical canons and tolerating no innovation;² but he might also learn how his letters had been abused by some. He should therefore as soon as possible send a decree of confirmation (*βεβαιοῦν*) for the Synod of Chalcedon, so that no one might have any further doubt as to the judgment of his holiness.³

A good while before Marcian thus wrote to the Pope, he, on hearing of the advances of the Monophysites in Palestine, had, in his letter to Julian of Cos, of the 25th November 452,⁴ expressed himself decidedly against them, and in behalf of the Patriarch Juvenal of Jerusalem, whom they had driven away. Somewhat later, but also before the reception of the last imperial letter, Leo had again appealed to the Emperor and the Empress Pulcheria with complaints against Anatolius, because the Bishop of Constantinople had removed from his post his Archdeacon Aetius, the zealous opponent of the Nestorians and Eutychians, who is so well known to us, and appointed him to be priest of a cemetery, and in opposition to all the rules had ordained him at the sixth hour of a Saturday (instead of in the night between Saturday and Sunday),⁵ and thus, under the pretext of promoting him, had exiled him, and had in his place promoted an Eutychian to be archdeacon, the deacon Andrew, whom he had himself previously deposed for heresy. At the same time Leo requests the Emperor and the Empress to regard Bishop Julian of Cos as his Nuntius at the court of Constantinople, and to be favourable to him.⁶

¹ The Ballerini make on this (t. ii. p. 1182) the remark : *Litteræ ergo apostolicæ sedis, quibus confirmabantur Synodi generales, legendæ erant in ecclesiis Orientis, hæcque confirmatio in omnium notitiam deducenda erat, ne quis de ea ambigens decretis Synodi reluctari posset. Ecce ergo necessarie confirmationis Pontificiæ manifestissimum testimonium.*

² Leo himself (see below, p. 444), Pope Gelasius I. in his *Epist. ad Dardanos*, and also the Ballerini (t. i. p. 1188, note 3), have attributed too much value to this passage. To me it seems to be a kind of *captatio benevolentiae*, but not an actual commendation on account of his non-recognition of the 28th canon.

³ Among the letters of Leo, No. 110, in Ballerini, *l.c.* t. i. p. 1182; Mansi, t. vi. p. 215.

⁴ Leonis *Ep.* 109, in Baller. *l.c.* t. i. p. 1178; Mansi, t. vi. p. 212.

⁵ Cf. Leonis *Ep.* 9, c. i. in Mansi, t. v. p. 1241.

⁶ Leonis *Epp.* 111 and 112, in Baller. *l.c.* t. i. p. 1185 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 218 sqq.

From the expulsion of Aetius and the appointment of Andrew, as well as from some other occurrences at Constantinople, Leo thought himself justified in concluding that Anatolius was again in some measure favouring Eutychianism, to which he had formerly adhered. He therefore wrote, on the 11th of March 453, to Julian of Cos, and requested him on this account to use double care and circumspection that no heresy might find its way into Constantinople. If he remarked anything of the kind, he should only appeal to the orthodoxy of the Emperor, and he (the Pope), whenever he was hesitating or doubtful, would willingly give him directions. And if the Emperor had, at the request of the Pope, found fault with Anatolius on account of the charge brought against him,¹ Julian should also, on his side, show all zeal to the end that all offences might be removed, and the persecution of Aetius might cease. Subsequently, Leo speaks of the risings of the Eutychian monks in Palestine and Egypt, and requests Julian to collect all the Acts of the Synod of Chalcedon into one codex, and to translate them exactly into Latin, since the copies of the Acts already in Rome, on account of the difference of the language (only a few of the principal portions were as yet translated into Latin), could not be perfectly understood.²

Immediately after the despatch of these letters, the above-mentioned letter of the Emperor, in which he requested from the Pope the solemn confirmation of the Synod of Chalcedon, must have arrived in Rome, and Leo without delay sent forth a circular letter, dated March 21, 453, addressed to all the bishops who had been present at the Synod of Chalcedon,³ as follows: "I doubt not, brethren, that you all know how

¹ The Ballerini understand the words: *Et cum piissimi principes secundum obsecrationem meam dignati fuerint, fratrem Anatolium increpare*, as if it were said that the Emperor had already found fault with Anatolius, probably in consequence of the 104th letter of Leo. But I believe that Leo did not expect this blame to be imputed until after the reception of his 111th letter.

² Leonis *Ep.* 113, in Baller. *l.c.* t. i. p. 1189 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 220.

³ In the superscription the letter is addressed to the Synod of Chalcedon itself, which had long been dissolved; but the context of the letter shows the real state of the case. This has been overlooked by Schröckh in his *Kirchengesch.* Bd. xvii. S. 36 and 37.

willingly I have confirmed the doctrinal decree of the Synod of Chalcedon. You would have been able to learn this not only from the assent of my legates, but also from my letters to Anatolius of Constantinople, if he had brought the answer of the apostolic see to your knowledge. But that no one may doubt my approving of that which was decreed at the Synod of Chalcedon by universal consent in regard to the faith, I have directed this letter to all my brethren and fellow-bishops who were present at the Synod named, and the Emperor will, at my request, send it to you, so that you may all know that, not merely by my legates, but also by my own confirmation of it, I have agreed with you in what was done at the Synod, but only, as must always be repeated, in regard to the subject of the faith, on account of which the General Council (*generale concilium*) was assembled at the command of the Emperors, in agreement with the apostolic see.¹ But in regard to the regulations of the fathers of Nicæa, I admonish you that the rights of the individual churches must remain unaltered, as they were there established by the inspired fathers. No unlawful ambition must covet that which is not its own, and no one must increase by the diminution of others. And that which pride has obtained by enforced assent, and thinks to have confirmed by the name of a Council, is invalid, if it is in opposition to the canons of the aforesaid fathers (of Nicæa). How reverentially the apostolic see maintains the rules of these fathers, and that I by God's help shall be a guardian of the Catholic faith and of the ecclesiastical canons, you may see from the letter by which I have resisted the attempts of the Bishop of Constantinople."²

There is no doubt that Leo in this letter, on the one side, declares canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon as invalid,³ and, on the other side, that he formally recognizes as œcumenical this Synod itself, which was assembled as an Œcumenical Synod with his concurrence, and repeatedly called itself by this name (see pp. 265, 278, 328, and 430); but only in

¹ Cf. Leonis *Epp.* 73 and 76, in Baller. *l.c. t. i.* pp. 1019 and 1025, and above, see pp. 270, 277 ff.

² Leonis *Ep.* 114, in Baller. *l.c. t. i.* p. 1193 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 226.

³ Cf. Ballerini, *l.c. t. ii.* p. 1485, note 1.

its doctrinal portion (and only the first six sessions treated of doctrine).¹ This recognition by Leo is also clear from several of his subsequent letters, as from *Ep.* 144 to Julian of Cos, in which he says: The decrees of Chalcedon are *instruente Spiritu Sancto ad totius mundi salutem definita*; and in *Ep.* 145 to the succeeding Emperor, Leo, where he writes: "The Synod of Chalcedon was *ex divina inspiratione prolata*."² In the same manner a Roman Council, under one of his nearest successors, Felix III., in the year 485,³ reckoned our Council with the Nicene and the Ephesine (without mentioning that of Constantinople); and Gregory the Great placed it among those four Synods, which, as we know, he compared to the four Gospels (see vol. ii. p. 371). Moreover, in the long course of the centuries there has never arisen in the Church the slightest doubt of the œcumenical character of this Synod.

The decree of confirmation now described was transmitted by Pope Leo to the Emperor with an accompanying letter of the same date, in which he again declares that there could have been no doubt as to his confirmation of the Synod, unless Anatolius had kept back the letter which had been addressed to him, because it rebuked his ambition. Leo then thanks the Emperor for having commended his zeal in guarding the canons (see p. 441), and experiences a double joy because Marcian, as he sees, is disposed to maintain both the Nicene faith and the rights of the Churches. The formal confirmation of the definition of the faith at Chalcedon, which the Emperor had desired, he had now despatched, and he hoped that this would remove all occasion for discord, and would bring it about that apostolic doctrine and peace would everywhere prevail.⁴

On the same day he wrote in very nearly the same terms to the Empress Pulcheria (*Ep.* 116), adding: "the present rulers combine princely power with apostolic doctrine;" and

¹ Baluze therefore says that with the sixth session the Synod ceases to be œcumenical. Mansi, t. vii. p. 668, n. 40.

² In Baller. *l.c.* t. i. pp. 1300 and 1301; Mansi, t. vi. pp. 307 and 308.

³ Hardouin, t. ii. p. 855; Mansi, t. vii. p. 1140.

⁴ Leonis *Æp.* 115, in Baller. *l.c.* t. i. p. 1199 sqq.; Mansi, t. vi. p. 230.

in a fourth letter of the same date, he charged his Nuntius at Constantinople, Bishop Julian of Cos, to use his influence with the Emperor, so that the papal decree confirming the Synod should be sent to all the bishops of the Empire. To the Empress Eudocia, the widow of the Emperor Theodosius II., who supported the Monophysites in Palestine, he has, he adds, at the wish of Marcian, addressed a hortatory letter; but in the matter of the deposed Archdeacon Actius, Julian must take no further steps lest harm should be done. Finally, he says that to Anatolius he writes no longer, since he persists in his presumption, and has induced the Illyrian bishops also to subscribe the 28th canon.¹

He also expressed his displeasure with Anatolius in his 119th letter to Archbishop Maximus of Antioch (June 11, 453), and in the letter to Proterius, the new Bishop of Alexandria, dated March 10, 454 (*Ep.* 129), and had the more reason for doing so as undoubtedly Anatolius was in fault, since the papal decree confirming the Synod was not publicly read in its entirety in the churches of the Greek Empire, but only its first part, containing the confirmation of the doctrinal decree; while the second, the rejection of canon 28, had not been published. Leo complained of this in his 127th letter, addressed to Julian of Cos (dated January 9, 454); he declared, however, two months later, in a letter to the Emperor (*Ep.* 128), who had interceded for Anatolius, that he would willingly restore his favour to him, if he would do justice in the matter of the canons, and cease to violate the rights of other bishops.

SEC. 207. *The Greeks seem to sacrifice the 28th Canon.*

Upon this Anatolius himself appealed again to the Pope in a very courteous letter, written in the month of April 454, and assured him how greatly he was pained by the interruption of correspondence, and how far he was from setting himself against any order contained in Leo's letters. He had therefore restored Archdeacon Actius and excluded Andrew from the Church. In regard to that which the Synod of Chalcedon

¹ Leonis *Ep.* 117, in Baller. *l.c.* t. i. p. 1208; Mansi, t. vi. p. 234 sq.

had decreed in favour of the see of Constantinople, he was not in fault, since he had always loved peace and humility. But the clergy of Constantinople and the bishops belonging to this province had demanded that decree; *but the confirmation of it depended upon the Pope (cum et sic gestorum vis omnis et confirmatio auctoritati vestre Beatitudinis fuerit reservata).*¹

Pope Leo again entered into correspondence with Anatolius, wrote to him on the 29th of May 454 (*Ep.* 135), and blamed him for wishing to lay all the blame upon the clergy, and not also confessing his own fault. He must now lay aside the desire for privileges which would not be conceded to him, and be contented with the limits which the regulations of the fathers had appointed, and observe and maintain the decrees which the Council of Nicæa had given for the honour and confirmation of the episcopal office.—At the same time Leo wrote also to the Emperor (*Ep.* 136), that he would again be reconciled to Anatolius on condition that he would increase more by humility than by presumption, and would observe the canons of the fathers which had been given for the peace of the Church.

From that time Leo continued to exchange letters with Anatolius and his successor Gennadius, but there was nothing more said between them on the subject of the 28th canon, and Leo was able and was bound to assume that, as it had not received the papal sanction, it was now given up by the Greeks.² Not only the Synod of Chalcedon itself, but in particular Anatolius, and also the Emperor Marcian, had expressly declared that this canon required, in order to its validity, the approbation of the apostolic see (see above, p. 431). Anatolius had at last himself said this most clearly in the Latin words of his Eirenicon quoted above. In fact, the Greeks for a long time made no further appeal to this canon, and even omitted it from their collections, so that they, too, adduced only twenty-seven canons of Chalcedon (see above, p. 420).

¹ The letter, with the exception of the subscription, was originally sent to Leo in Latin, and is No. 132 among those of Leo, in Baller. *l.c.* t. i. p. 1261; Mansi, t. vi. p. 277; see *ibid.* n. 1.

² Cf. Hergenröther, *Photius*, Bd. i. S. 87 f., and Moy, *Archiv* etc., 1864, Heft 6, S. 471 f.

On the other hand, Anatolius and his successors practically retained the privileges conceded to their see at Chalcedon, and never gave actual effect to their courteous words and the assurances which they made to the Pope. Indeed, Bishop Acacius of Constantinople set himself with peculiar energy (472) to exercise to the utmost the extended privileges of his see. The consequence was, that several of the successors of Leo, particularly Simplicius and Felix III., also protested against this, and the latter pronounced a sentence of deposition upon Acacius. In the controversy which grew out of this, Pope Gelasius, in his letter, *Ad episcopos Dardaniæ*, expressed himself very strongly, not only on the rights of the Roman see, but also on the arrogated right of Constantinople, and remarked, in particular, that if the accidental and secular circumstance that the Emperor resided anywhere should make the church of that place a patriarchal church, then must Ravenna, Milan, Sirmium, and Trier (Trèves) be also patriarchates, since these cities had also long been residences.¹

As, however, the bishops of Constantinople were protected and supported on this point by the Byzantine Emperors, they remained in possession of the contested prerogatives, and even began to make the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem more and more dependent upon them. The Emperor Justinian also, in his 131st Novel, c. 1, again expressly confirmed the high rank of the see of Constantinople, and the Trullan Synod, in its 36th canon, renewed precisely the 28th canon of Chalcedon. At last the loud protest of Rome became silent, although, as the Ballerini maintain,² an express recognition of that canon has never been given by Rome. This must, however, be limited by the fact that at the time when the Latin Empire and a Latin patriarch was established at Constantinople, the fourth Lateran Synod, under Pope Innocent III., A.D. 1215, in its

¹ Mansi, t. viii. p. 58; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 912.

² T. ii. p. 515, note, and p. 1485, note. Apart from and before them Baronius (*ad ann.* 451, n. 135, and *ad ann.* 381, n. 35) had endeavoured to prove the invalidity of the 28th canon. The Gallican Edmund Richer endeavoured (*Hist. Concil. General.* t. i. lib. i. c. 8) to confute him; but even the learned Le Quien decided against the validity of this canon (*Oriens Christian.* t. i. p. 29 sq.).

5th canon, declared that the patriarch of Constantinople should take rank immediately after Rome, and before Alexandria and Antioch.¹

SEC. 208. *Subsequent History of Monophysitism.*

Completeness requires that we should briefly relate the further history of the Eutychian or Monophysite heresy, since it was most solemnly rejected at Chalcedon, but for all that was by no means practically suppressed, but, on the contrary, continued for centuries to disturb the Church, and even to some extent contended with it. The first province in which, immediately after the close of our Synod, it attained to great power was Palestine. Hither an Alexandrian monk, named Theodosius, who had been present at Chalcedon, hastened immediately and represented to the monks of Palestine that the Synod of Chalcedon had betrayed the true faith and sanctioned Nestorianism. Misled by him, almost all of the more than 10,000 monks of Palestine were ready indeed to condemn the doctrine of Eutyches, that the human nature [of Christ] was, as it were, absorbed by the divine; but they would not accept the Dyophysitism of the Synod of Chalcedon, on the ground that the confession of two natures must logically lead to the confession of two persons, and thus to Nestorianism. They persisted, therefore, strongly in the assertion of only one nature, without explaining in what manner the Godhead and the manhood could be one nature. This new tendency, which on the one side rejected Eutychianism, and on the other the Synod of Chalcedon, is called the Monophysite *in specie*, in distinction from the Eutychian.

As the Patriarch Juvenal of Jerusalem did not respond to the demand of the monks of Palestine, that he would anathematize the decrees of Chalcedon, they, supported by Eudocia, the widow of Theodosius II.,² stirred up an insurrection, drove away Juvenal, raised the monk Theodosius, already named, to the patriarchate, even set fire, in the tumult, to some houses, and killed several of the leading Dyophysites. They acted in

¹ Cf. vol. ii. p. 359.

² Cf. *Ep.* 117 of Pope Leo, and p. 445.

the same manner in the other cities of Palestine, and everywhere deposed the legitimate bishops. The Emperor took measures to instruct and quiet the fanatical rioters, and to punish the most guilty of them, and we still possess edicts belonging to this question.¹ Theodosius himself fled, in 453, to the monks of Mount Sinai; Juvenal and the other expelled Catholic bishops were reinstated, and many of the Monophysites, but by no means all, were again united with the Church.

✓ The second region in which the Synod of Chalcedon was repudiated and the banner of Monophysitism raised was Egypt. Even at Chalcedon, thirteen Egyptian bishops had refused to subscribe, on the empty pretext that, since the deposition of Dioscurus, they had no patriarch, and that without his permission they had no right to take such an important step (see p. 333 f.). In order to appease the monks, the Emperor Marcian wrote to them and assured them that the Synod of Chalcedon had made no innovation in the faith.² When Proterius, a very upright man, had been chosen patriarch of Alexandria, the very numerous party of Dioscurus came forward in opposition to him, and made use of the same means of riot as in Palestine. The imperial soldiers, who were to have quieted the rising, were driven by the populace into the Serapeum and burnt alive, and it was only a great military force that was able to restore order. But now two distinguished clerics, Timothy, surnamed *Ælurus* (*αἰλουρος* = Cat), and Peter Mongus (*μογγός* = Hoarse), fell away from Proterius, and brought the monks and several bishops and others to their side, pronounced an anathema on the Synod of Chalcedon, and availed themselves of the death of the Emperor Marcian (A.D. 457), in order, with the help of the populace of Alexandria, by a sudden attack, to get possession of the cathedral of the city. Timothy then had himself there immediately consecrated bishop, and then again consecrated other bishops and priests. Proterius was murdered in the baptistry, and Timothy raised to the see of Alexandria. He did not neglect, moreover, to depose the Dyophysite bishops

¹ Mansi, t. vii. pp. 483, 487, 506, 510, 514, 520.

² Mansi, t. vii. pp. 482, 517; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 663; cf. Tillemont, t. xv. p. 774.

and priests in all the other cities of Egypt, and to confer their offices upon his adherents. A Synod held by him also pronounced an anathema on Chalcedon, Leo, and Anatolius.

Both parties in Egypt, the orthodox and the Monophysite, appealed to the new Emperor, Leo I., for protection and confirmation, while Pope Leo demanded that severity should be used towards the heretics. The Emperor then required of all the bishops of his Empire an opinion respecting the Synod of Chalcedon and Timothy Ælurus; and almost all the bishops, to the number of 1600, agreed that the decrees of Chalcedon should be maintained, and that Ælurus must be deposed.¹ This was done, and Ælurus was at the same time banished to Cherson, and another Timothy, named The White and Salophaciolus, was raised to the see of Alexandria, and was able to preserve ecclesiastical peace there until 475.

The third patriarchate of which the Monophysites got possession, after the Synod of Chalcedon, was that of Antioch. A monk of Constantinople, Peter, surnamed *γναφεύς*, *Fullo* (the fuller), from the trade which he carried on in the monastery, succeeded in gaining the special favour of Zeno, the son-in-law of the Emperor Leo, and, when he received a command in the East, proceeded with him to Antioch, and there founded, with the allied party of the Apollinarians who were still here, a strong faction against the Patriarch Martyrius, and made his position so uncomfortable that he shortly resigned his office. Peter Fullo now himself took possession of the see of Antioch, and, in order to strengthen the Monophysite party, he introduced into the *Trisagion* the words: (Holy Lord God) "Who for us wast crucified." *Per communicationem idiomatum* we may say, without objection, "God was crucified;" but when the *idioma* "crucified" is united with the invocation *Ter sanctus* in the *Trisagion*, then it is implied that, together with the Son, the Father and the Spirit had also suffered upon the cross. For the Eutychian such an extension of the suffering to the Father and the Spirit was consistent; for, in his opinion, after the union there was present in Christ only one nature, the divine, which He has in common with

¹ Many such letters in reply from all the provinces we still possess in the *Codex encyclicus*, see above, p. 294 f.

the Father and the Holy Spirit. If, on the contrary, the Dyophysite says: "God (*i.e.* the Son of God) was crucified," he adds (expressly or tacitly): "in the flesh," and so not in that which He has in common with the Father and the Spirit, but in that which He has in common with us.

The Emperor Leo, however, soon caused Peter Fullo to be again deposed by a Synod and banished to Oasis, and generally maintained the importance of the Synod of Chalcedon. He was succeeded by his grandson, Leo II, and he, again, dying early, by his father Zeno, husband of the daughter of Leo I, who, however, was expelled in 475 by the usurper Basiliscus. The latter immediately showed himself as protector of the Monophysites, restored *Ælurus* and the Fuller again to their patriarchates, and issued an edict, requiring that the celebrated letter of Pope Leo to Flavian (*Ep.* 28) and the "innovations" of the Synod of Chalcedon should be anathematized by all the bishops. About 500 bishops from the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem subscribed, in part with servile additions. On the contrary, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Acacius, himself refused his signature persistently, and was supported in his refusal by the whole populace, which rose in a threatening manner against the usurper. As at the same time the expelled Emperor Zeno drew near with an army, Basiliscus was under the necessity of reconciling himself with Acacius as quickly as possible, and of recalling his edict, but was nevertheless immediately afterwards overthrown by Zeno, and taken prisoner.

About the same time Timothy *Ælurus* died, and his friend Peter Mongus was chosen patriarch of Alexandria. But the Emperor again deposed him and Peter Fullo of Antioch, and for a time took some further steps against the Monophysites. But before long Zeno altered his point of view, and took up that unhappy plan of union which had been worked out by Acacius of Constantinople and Peter Mongus, who for this reason was again restored to favour. Zeno sent forth, in the year 482, his famous *Henoticon*, that is, an edict to the bishops, clergy, monks, and all Christians of Alexandria, Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, in which, on the

one hand, the true manhood and the true Godhead of Christ were declared, Nestorius as well as Eutyches anathematized, and the anathematisms of Cyril approved; but, on the other hand, every other creed than that of Nicæa, as completed at Constantinople, and thus that of Chalcedon, was rejected, the expressions "one" or "two natures" were intentionally avoided, and very equivocal reference was made to the Synod of Chalcedon in the words: "If any one thinks or has thought otherwise, at Chalcedon or at any other Synod, let him be anathema." This edict, with its spirit of compromise and its patching up of the points of controversy, was now to be received by both parties, the orthodox and the Monophysite, as a means of union and a bond of communion, and thus the whole of the more recent development of the Christian doctrinal consciousness was to be effaced.

As we saw, the Henoticon was in the first instance addressed to the Christians in Egypt etc., but its application was at the same time universal, and it was intended to establish religious peace in the whole Empire. It produced, in fact, the very opposite, and satisfied none of the different parties. The strict Monophysites, for instance, demanded the simple repudiation of the Synod of Chalcedon and of Dyophysitism; to the Nestorians and Antiochenes the approval of the anathematisms of Cyril was an offence; and the orthodox were offended not only by the attack upon the importance of the Synod of Chalcedon and the spirit of compromise generally, but by the fact that the Emperor presumed to prescribe the faith.

A beginning was made with the introduction of the Henoticon at Alexandria by Peter Mongus, one of its originators, who, as a reward for doing so, was again elevated to the see of that place, the orthodox patriarch, John Talaia, being removed. He now, in fact, brought about in Alexandria, on the basis of the Henoticon, an external ecclesiastical reunion of the Monophysites and the orthodox, and, at the desire of the Emperor, sent an account of this soon afterwards to Rome and to Constantinople. But a portion of his previous adherents, especially many of the monks, were highly dissatisfied with this concession to the orthodox, and therefore separated themselves from the patriarch, and founded a special

Monophysite sect, under the ambiguous designation of ἀκέφαλοι (*i.e.* "Headless").

The results were similar in the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, where the majority of the Monophysites and the orthodox now united on the basis and in the sense of the Henoticon, and the opposing bishops were deprived of their posts, chiefly by the efforts of Peter Fullo, who for this service was again raised to the see of Antioch. From all sides, from Egypt and from the East, complaints of this were brought to Rome, and Felix III. (Pope since 483) sent two bishops to Constantinople in order to obtain a recognition of the legal importance of the Synod of Chalcedon, and to assert the rights of the bishops who had been dispossessed. The Emperor, by imprisonment and bribery, brought over the legates to his side; but the Pope saw through the intrigue, and at a Synod in Rome (484) pronounced an anathema upon Acacius, the originator of all this confusion.¹ As, however, Acacius refused to receive the papal decree, some monks fastened it to his cloak as he was about to leave the church. For this they were punished, some with death, some with imprisonment. In revenge Acacius now struck the name of the Pope out of the diptychs of Constantinople, and, under the protection of the Emperor, remained in his office. Thus arose a temporary schism between the Latin and Greek Churches, which lasted on after the death of Acacius (489), Peter Mongus (490), Peter Fullo (488), and the Emperor Zeno (491), under his and their successors. The Emperor Anastasius, for example, violently maintained the point of view of the Henoticon, and was guilty of all kinds of arbitrary measures; in his later years he more and more visibly approached to Monophysitism proper. This occasioned here and there, particularly in the chief city, violent scenes, and even bloody fights between the parties, and the deposition and excommunication of Macedonius of Constantinople, who had returned to orthodoxy (511), could only still further increase the hatred against the Emperor. The new Patriarch Timothy wavered hesitatingly between the two sides, and when the

¹ Cf. the dissertation of Valesius, *De Acacio* etc., in the appendix to his edition of the Church History of Evagrius.

Emperor at last determined to introduce by force the addition already mentioned to the Trisagion, the combustible material in Constantinople kindled to a thorough insurrection.

About the same time, at the beginning of the sixth century, Flavian, the new Patriarch of Antioch, from being a supporter of the Henoticon, had become an adherent of Chalcedon; for which reason his neighbour, Bishop Xenaias or Philoxenus of Hierapolis, stirred up a rebellion against the patriarch, and although the people of Antioch took the part of the latter, yet he was expelled from his see, and it was conferred, A.D. 513, upon one of the most violent enemies of the Synod of Chalcedon, the Monophysite monk Severus. At the same time the Patriarch Elias of Jerusalem was expelled from his office because he did not agree with Severus. At that time (since 508) there sat upon the episcopal throne of Alexandria John Niceota (Machiota), who quite openly passed over, beyond the Henoticon, to strict Monophysitism.

The General Vitalian, availing himself of the universal discontent of the orthodox with the Emperor, advanced upon Constantinople in the year 514 with 60,000 men, and extorted from the Emperor a promise to reinstate the deposed friends of the Synod of Chalcedon, and to re-establish the unity of the Church by a new Œcumenical Synod. But the Emperor was not in earnest, and although under constraint from Vitalian, he entered into communication with Pope Hormisdas, with a view of putting an end to the schism; he refused to accept the first necessary condition laid down by the Pope, namely, the recognition of the Synod of Chalcedon, and of the famous letter of Pope Leo the Great. Scarcely, however, was the Emperor Anastasius dead, in the year 518, when better times began for the orthodox party. In Constantinople itself it had only been suppressed by force; as, however, the orthodox were favoured by the new Emperor, the Emperor Justin I., and still more by his afterwards so famous nephew, Justinian, to whom he, so to speak, entrusted the department of public worship, the people of Constantinople compelled the Patriarch John to recognize solemnly the Synod of Chalcedon, and to pronounce an anathema upon the Monophysite Patriarch Severus of Antioch. Soon afterwards, this Severus,

then the most important man among the Monophysites, and also their most fruitful writer, was accused of many crimes, and even of bloody acts of violence, against the orthodox, and was removed from his office. It was only by flight that he was able to escape from a more severe punishment, and the above-named Philoxenus, also a writer of the Monophysites, was sent into banishment, and even, as the story went, put to death in exile. The orthodox party now became again dominant in Antioch and in the whole of Syria, and being so they did not always keep within the bounds of moderation. But that which was most important was the reconciliation between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople, which took place in the year 519, and was solemnly accomplished in the latter city through the legates of Pope Hormisdas. The imperial court and the Patriarch John recognized the anathema formerly pronounced upon Acacius, the name of Acacius and of several of his followers, as well as those of the Emperor Zeno and of Anastasius, were struck out of the Church books, and the patriarch recommended complete agreement with the Roman Church. This example was followed by most of the other Greek and Oriental bishops, so that now, everywhere in the Roman Empire, with the exception of Egypt, the faith of Chalcedon obtained the upper hand.

When, in the year 527, the Emperor Justinian came to the throne, he continued the favour to the orthodox which he had shown under his uncle, and gave command that all the Churches of the East should receive the four Œcumenical Synods, and so also that of Chalcedon. His consort Theodora, on the contrary, favoured Monophysitism, and even among the inhabitants of Constantinople sympathy was shown for the heresy. It was, perhaps, for this reason that the Emperor appointed in the year 533 a conference of the leading men of both parties. At the head of the Catholic bishops stood Hypatius of Ephesus, and the Monophysite members of the conference were adherents of Severus, who had now become the head of a distinct party, the Severians. It is worthy of notice that it was at this religious conference that the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita were first publicly named, and this on the side of the Severians. The attempt

at union remained fruitless, but in Constantinople itself the new Patriarch Anthinus clearly leaned to the side of Monophysitism. He was deposed, and his successor, Mennas, in union with the Emperor, again expelled the heads of the Monophysites from the capital, where they had already settled; and even in Alexandria an orthodox patriarch, Paul, formerly an abbot, came to the archiepiscopal throne.

But at this very time the cunning Empress endeavoured to set up a citadel for Monophysitism even in Rome, promising to Vigilius, the Roman deacon and secretary at Constantinople, the papal dignity on condition that he would again reinstate Anthimus of Constantinople, and declare against the Synod of Chalcedon. The ambitious Vigilius consented to these conditions; and then the imperial general in Italy, the famous Belisarius, received from Theodora the charge to depose Pope Silverius on any pretext whatever, and to bring about the elevation of Vigilius. In order, like Pilate, to salve his conscience, Belisarius said, "She shall answer for it before Christ," and brought forward the false accusation that Silverius had entered into a treasonous alliance with the Ostrogoths, promising to deliver over to them the city of Rome, and on this pretext he imprisoned the Pope in a monk's habit. Under the influence of Belisarius, Vigilius was immediately elected Pope (538), without being able to conceal from himself that, as long as Silverius lived, the see could not be vacated. Silverius, however, died so early as 540, a prisoner in the island of Palmaria (in the Mediterranean Sea), as it was asserted, of hunger, and by the fault of Vigilius. The latter upon this resigned, as Baronius supposes (*ad ann.* 540, n. 5), in the hope of being, by the influence of Belisarius, elected anew, and now regularly, and so it actually happened. From this time Vigilius came forward as defender of the Synod of Chalcedon, having never been Monophysite at heart.

For all this the contentions were not ended, but occasion was given for new disturbances by the addition in the Trisagion: "One of the Trinity was crucified." Very many of the orthodox took no offence at this statement; but as it was with the Monophysites that it was chiefly in use, the others determined to reject it, and named the adherents of

this formula Theopaschites.¹ Thus it came to pass that this formula now (518) became an apple of discord among the Catholics themselves. The monk John Maxentius of Constantinople, and other monks, for instance, wished to represent this formula as the standard of orthodoxy, and as absolutely necessary; but the Patriarch John of Constantinople and the legates of Pope Hormisdas, to whom Maxentius appealed, would not consent to this exaggeration, although they did not themselves reject the formula. The Emperor Justinian, on the contrary, took the side of the formula, and wished to obtain its confirmation from the Pope; but Hormisdas declared, after protracted delay, that this proposition in the Trisagion was useless, and even dangerous (not because it was wrong in itself, but because it was explained with a heretical meaning by the Monophysites).² In the meantime the friends of Maxentius had asked from other theologians their opinion of their formula, and had obtained from Fulgentius of Ruspe and Dionysius Exiguus the recognition of the orthodoxy of its contents.

A new element was now introduced by another party of Greek monks, named from their strict watchfulness ἀκοίμητοι, that is, the "Sleepless," who in their opposition to this phrase fell back into Nestorianism, and again rejected the expression θεοτόκος. This gave to the dogma-loving Emperor Justinian occasion to obtain from Rome an anathema on these monks and an approval of the formula: "One of the Trinity suffered." Pope John II. almost responded to his wish, although he did not directly approve of the formula, and his successor, Agapetus I., acted in the same way; and at last Justinian brought it about that the fifth Œcumenical Council, held in his reign, directly approved the formula in question.³

As the Theopaschite controversy was evidently only an outcome of the Monophysite, so the great dispute respecting

¹ The statement that Pope Felix declared strongly against this proposition rests upon a false document, as Valesius, *Diss. de Petro, Antioch. Episc., qui Fullo cognominatus est*, in the beginning of his edition of the Church History of Evagrius, and Le Quien in *Opp. S. Joh. Damasc.* t. i. p. 478, have shown.

² Cf. Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccl.* t. v. p. 434 sq., ed. Venet. 1778.

³ *Collat.* viii. can. 10; cf. Henric. Noris, *Dissert. de uno ex trinitate passo*, and Natal. Alex. *l.c.* p. 435.

the three chapters, which broke out somewhat later also in the camp of orthodoxy, is closely connected with the Monophysite controversies. Under the pretext that even the strictest Monophysites might easily again be united with the Church, if only a sentence were issued against Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa, as suspected of Nestorianism, the Origenist Theodore Ascidas, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, entrapped the Emperor Justinian, about the middle of the sixth century, into the so-called controversy of the three chapters, which could not be brought to a full conclusion even by the fifth Œcumenical Synod (553).

But still more numerous contentions broke out among the Monophysites themselves. One of their heads, already named, Severus, formerly Patriarch of Antioch, who had been living at Alexandria since 518, here put forth (519) the assertion that "the body of Christ was corruptible." Another head of the Monophysites, Bishop Julian of Halicarnassus, at that time also in Alexandria, on the other hand, declared for the incorruptibility of the body of Christ, on the ground that if it were corruptible then it would be necessary to assume the existence of two natures in Christ, a divine and a human. Almost the whole of Alexandria took part in this controversy, and the adherents of Severus received the name of *φθαρτολάτραι* or *Corrupticolæ* (i.e. worshippers of the corruptible), while those of Julian were entitled *ἀφθαρτοδοκῆται* (that is, teachers of the incorruptible) or Phantasiastæ (because they could believe only in an apparent body). When, soon after this, Timothy the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria died, each of the two parties, the Phthartolatrai and Aphthartodocetæ, chose a patriarch for themselves; the former Theodosius, the latter Gaianus; thus came into use the party names of Theodosians (the adherents of Severus) and Gaianites (the Julianists). The latter were also called by their opponents Manichæans, because any one who regarded the body of Christ as incorruptible could only, like the Manichæans, hold a mere *seeming* suffering of Christ. In fact, the doctrine of the before-named Philoxenus or Xeniās, who was also an Aphthartodocete, came quite near to Docetism, since he said: "Christ was properly subject neither to suffering nor to any

other human necessities, but had voluntarily undertaken them, by a certain condescension, in order to accomplish our salvation." The statement that the body of Christ is incorruptible pleased so greatly the Emperor Justinian, now enfeebled by age, and seemed to him so well adapted to the orthodox system of doctrine, that he wanted to compel the bishops of his Empire to adopt it.¹ But he died in the year 565, more than eighty years old.

The Phthartolatrai as well as Aphthartodocetæ fell again into smaller parties, the latter into the *κτιστολάτραι* and *ἀκτιστηταί*, since the former affirmed the question: "Was the incorruptible body of Christ created?" while the others enthusiastically negatived it. Similarly the Phthartolatrai quarrelled over the question: "Whether, if the body is corruptible, it must not be admitted that there was something which Christ did not know, as He Himself often shows in Holy Scripture?"² This assertion of the defect of knowledge in Christ was first put forward by the Monophysite deacon Themistius of Alexandria, and his adherents received the name of Agnoetæ (*ἀγνοηταί*) or Themistianus. As the Patriarch Timothy of Alexandria and his successor Theodosius (about A.D. 537-539) opposed them and excommunicated them, since the hypothesis of *ἀγνοεῖν* must logically lead to the acceptance of two natures, they henceforth formed a separate sect, which lasted until the eighth century.

It further caused very evil repute to the Monophysites that the Tritheists afterwards proceeded from them.³ The founder of this sect was not, as was formerly supposed, the philosopher John Philoponus, but, as is clear from the publications of Assemani,⁴ the Monophysite John Ascunages, the president of a school of philosophy at Constantinople in the sixth century, who in presence of the Emperor Justinian thus expressed his view: "In Christ I acknowledge only one nature, but in the Trinity I ascribe to each Person a

¹ Cf. Assemani, *Biblioth. juris orient.* t. iii. p. 294.

² Nat. Alex. t. v. p. 483.

³ A full discussion of the Tritheists is given by Schönfelder, *Die Kirchengeschichte des Joh. v. Ephesus*, München, 1862, S. 267-310.

⁴ *Bibl. orient.* t. ii. p. 327.

particular nature." The Emperor banished him, the Patriarch of Constantinople excommunicated him; but Philoponus and other Monophysites took his side, and developed this view further. In particular, Philoponus brought it into connection with the Aristotelian distinction of *genus*, *species*, and *individuum*, by the proposition: "The three Persons are related to the Godhead as three individuals to their species." In this manner the Persons were certainly made to be Gods, and Tritheism was taught. A leading defender of this tendency was also the monk Athanasius, a grandson of the Empress Theodora, the consort of Justinian, who, like Philoponus, endeavoured to defend this doctrine by his writings. No less does Stephen Gobarus (about A.D. 600) belong to the celebrated writers of the Tritheistic party.¹ For the rest, nearly all the other Monophysites declared against these Tritheists, who, from their place of assembly, the Condobaudos in Constantinople, were named Condobaudites.² These, however, soon petitioned the Emperor Justin II. (565–578) to have their controversy with the other Monophysites examined. Both parties appointed their representatives, and the decision of the question was left to the Catholic Patriarch John of Constantinople, and it was given against the Tritheists. These now began to have controversies among themselves, since Philoponus maintained in reference to the resurrection of the flesh: "The body of man passes into corruption in matter *and* form," whilst another leader of the Tritheists, Bishop Conon of Tarsus in Cilicia, declared the matter but not the form to be corruptible. Then arose the parties of the Cononites and the Philoponists, who applied to each other the greatest variety of nicknames which they could invent. It is probable that Philoponus also denied altogether the resurrection of the flesh, as Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 21) informs us.

The contentions among the Monophysites, however, did not yet cease, especially as the Patriarch Damian of Alexandria, in his opposition to the Tritheists, again went close to Sabellianism, reduced the divine Persons almost to mere attributes,

¹ An extract from his work is given by Photius, *Biblioth. cod.* 232; cf. Walch, *Ketzergesch.* Bd. viii. S. 877.

² Cf. Schönfelder, *l.c.* S. 278 f. and 294.

and, on the other side, assigned a special *ὑπαρξίς* to the divine nature (essence) which is common to the three Persons. The patriarch of Antioch, Peter of Callinico, entered the lists against him, and the adherents of the Alexandrian Patriarch received the names of Damianites and Tetradites, because they had taught the doctrine of four Gods,—the three Persons, and the higher Godhead (the divine nature) which is common to them, but which yet has a proper existence.

Another controversy was kindled by Stephen Niobes, teacher of sciences (Sophist) at Alexandria, by the assertion "that the previous Monophysitism is a half measure, for if only one nature is admitted, then there could be no longer any distinction between the divine and the human in Christ." Both the Alexandrian and the Antiochene patriarchs, Damian and Peter (of Callinico), declared against him; but other distinguished Monophysites, particularly the priest Probus of Antioch and the abbot John of Syria, took his side, and thus formed the sect of the Niobites. They were expelled by the other Monophysites, and many of them afterwards returned into the Catholic Church.

The very opposition of the Niobites to the ordinary Monophysites leaves us to suppose that many Monophysites, since they distinguished the divine and the human in Christ, deviated from the doctrine of the Church only in words, and that their Shibboleth, "only one nature," did not quite agree with their own views. As now, besides, on the one hand intellectual superiority, and on the other protection and advancement by the Emperors were distinctly on the side of the orthodox, imminent destruction threatened the Monophysites under the Emperor Justinian, about the middle of the sixth century. But the indefatigable monk, Jacob Baradai (*i.e.* "The Ragged") of Syria, consecrated Bishop of Edessa and general head of all the Monophysites in the East in the year 541, succeeded, by an activity carried on through thirty-three years, in rearranging and strengthening Monophysite Christianity within and without the Roman Empire, by everywhere appointing new bishops and priests for his party. In particular, he revived the Monophysite patriarchate of Antioch, which, to the present day, forms the centre of all the Mono-

physite Churches of Syria and of many other provinces in the East. Out of gratitude to him, first the Syrian, and afterwards almost all the other Monophysites called themselves Jacobite Christians.

The Monophysites have maintained their position until now—(1) In Syria, Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Cyprus, and Palestine; and all are subject to the Patriarch of Antioch (without a fixed see), and a Maphrian (a kind of primate), who is dependent upon him, for the provinces lying east from Syria. But as in earlier times, so in later, and especially in the Middle Ages, there have not been wanting divisions and controversies among these Monophysites, so that for a considerable time there were three Syrian patriarchates among them. At present their patriarch resides in the monastery of Zapharan, near Mardin (in the neighbourhood of Bagdad), and the Maphrian in the monastery of S. Matthew, near Mosul; but they have not now many bishops under them.¹ A portion of the Jacobites united in the year 1646 with Rome, and for these Uniates the patriarchate of the Catholic Syrians was erected at Aleppo.

(2) The second centre of the Monophysites is Armenia, where the Patriarch Nerses of Ashtarag is said to have anathematized the Council of Chalcedon, in the year 527, at the Synod of Devin. That this was not so will appear later on. Monophysitism, however, about that time was firmly established in that country; and along with heresy all kinds of superstition, and even half Judaic ceremonies, found their way among the Armenians. Their patriarch bears the title of Catholicus; but here, as in Syria, party divisions have at times produced several patriarchates. By degrees, however, they reunited, so that the Catholicus of Etshmiadsin became Pope among them, while the other Armenian patriarchs—at Jerusalem, Sis, and Constantinople—became his suffragans. The patriarch of Constantinople has, however, in later times, succeeded in making himself again independent. Etshmiadsin, which was formerly under the Persian rule, was (in 1827),

¹ On Jacob Baradai and the Jacobite Church, cf. Silbernagel, *Verfassung und gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients*, Landshut, 1865, S. 253-265.

with other parts of Armenia, embodied by Paskewitsch in the Russian Empire.¹ So early as the year 1439 a portion of the Armenians, at the Synod of Florence, became again united with the Catholic Church, and these Uniates have their patriarch at Constantinople. To them belong also the Lazarists and the Mechitarists.²

(3) The third centre of the Monophysites is Egypt, where, with the name of Jacobite, they bear also that of Coptic Christians.—As under Justinian and Justin II. they were persecuted not without violence, they gave their opponents the name of Melchites (ܡܠܚܝܬܝܬܝܬ), Royalists, or court party; while they took the name of Copts, that is, original Egyptian Christians.³

Because they were oppressed by the Byzantine government, the Copts assisted in the conquest of Egypt by the Saracens in the year 640, and were by these reinstated in the possession of the patriarchate of Alexandria, but nevertheless, in the course of centuries, have often been forced to experience the intolerance of the Mahometans. They number now about 100,000 adherents. Their language in divine service is the old Coptic, they having, at the time of the rise of Monophysitism, out of hatred to the Byzantines, given up the Greek, which was then in universal use. The union concluded with them also at Florence, February 4, 1442, had no effect.⁴

(4) With the Monophysite patriarchate of Alexandria is connected also the Church of Abyssinia, which, by the very circumstance of this hierarchial union, was, in the fifth and sixth centuries, also involved in the Monophysite heresy. It is under a metropolitan or Abbuna, who is nominated by the Patriarch of Alexandria.⁵—From these four Monophysite centres several branch communities have extended into various provinces of Western and Central Asia, but without possessing any considerable importance.

¹ On the Armenian Church, cf. Silbernagel, *l.c.* S. 169–201.

² Cf. Silbernagel, *l.c.* S. 298, and Friedrich v. Hurter, *Aus dem Leben des hochw. H. Aristaces Azaria, Generalabts der Mechitaristen* etc., Wien, 1855.

³ On the Coptic Church, cf. Silbernagel, *l.c.* S. 228–245.

⁴ Cf. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarum*, 1713.

⁵ Cf. Silbernagel, *l.c.* S. 246–252.

INDEX

- ABRAHAM, Archimandrite, friend of Eutyches, 195.
- Abundius, papal legate, 263, 273.
- Abyssinia, Monophysite, 464.
- Acacius, Bishop of Berea, 23; his letter to the Synod of Ephesus, 84, 93; the Antiochenes write to him, 95; his testimony concerning Cyril, 112; he joins the Antiochenes, 118, 121; and now works for the union with Cyril, 123, 127.
- Acacius, Bishop of Melitene, of Monophysite tendencies, and opposed to Cyril, 140, 148, 183.
- Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, author of the Henoticon, 452.
- Acephaloi, a party of Monophysites, 454.
- Acemetae, Greek monks, 291, 458.
- Actors, excommunicated as long as they continue such, 170.
- Administration of property for gain forbidden to the clergy, 388.
- Ado, Bishop of Vienne, 164.
- Aethericus, Bishop of Smyrna, 242, 247, 249, 252, 310.
- Aetius, bishop's notary at Constantinople, 212; archdeacon and first notary at the Synod of Chalcedon, 320, 337, 424, 425; is removed from his post on account of his orthodoxy, 442; is restored, 446.
- Agnostie, a party of Monophysites, 460.
- Alban's, St., Synod at, A.D. 447, 178.
- Alexander, Bishop of Hierapolis, a Nestorian, 94; is opposed to the union, 123, 125, 145, 147, 148; deposed from his see, 152, 153.
- Alexandria, archbishopric of, rules all other Egyptian sees, 334.
- Alexandria, Synod at, A.D. 430, 28, 31.
- Anastasius, Emperor, a zealot for the Henoticon, 454.
- Anatolius, Patriarch of Constantinople after Flavian, 258; requests confirmation from the Pope, 267; unites with the orthodox party, 270, 276, 277; is present at the fourth Ecumenical Synod at Chalcedon, 297; special conference under him, 319, 342; is member of a commission, 345.
- Anazarbus, Synod at, A.D. 433, 148.
- Andrew, Bishop of Samosata, a Nestorian, 38, 118, 123, 124, 125, 127; letter to Alexander of Hierapolis, 133; is invited to a Synod by Theodoret, 146; goes over to the union, 149.
- Authimus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 457.
- Antidicomarianites, 169.
- Antioch, Patriarch of, claims rights over the island of Cyprus, 71; Jerusalem in the patriarchate of, 77; cedes somewhat to Jerusalem, 355, 382; the deposed Patriarch Domnus of, receives sustentation from church property, 370, 382.
- Antioch, Conciliabulum at, A.D. 432, 118; Synod at, A.D. 445, 173; Synod at, after Easter, A.D. 447 or 448, 178.
- Antiochene school, their Christology, 4; dissatisfied with Cyril and his anathematisms, 37, 53, 93, 97, 101, 104, 116; negotiations for union with Cyril, 118; union-creed of, accepted by Cyril, 129; Synod of, 133; union takes place, 134. (Cf. art. "Ephesus," third Ecumenical Synod.)
- Aphthartodocete, 459, 460.
- Apollinarianism, opposed by the Antiochene school, 4; Monophysitism at first called, 182, 188, 208.
- Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea in Syria, 2; his Christology, 2, 3.
- Apostates, monks, 170.

- Appeal, to Rome, recognized in the Greek State, practised by Eutyches, Theodoret, and others, 206, 209, 210, 216, 218, 251, 264.
- Aquilinus, Bishop of Byblus, is deposed by the Robber-Synod, 259.
- Arausicana* i., Synod, A.D. 441, 159.
- Arians, their baptism is valid, 169.
- Aristolaus, tribune and notary, 120; has to advance the work of peace between Cyril and John of Antioch, 121, 133, 153, 154.
- Arles, Synod at, A.D. 443 or 452, 167.
- Arles and Vienne, dispute between, concerning the primacy in Gaul, 267; Synods to be summoned by the Bishop of Arles, 169.
- Armenia, Armenian monks, Monophysite opponents of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 155; Monophysite centre, 463.
- Armentarius, Archbishop of Embrun, 157, 158.
- Asciusnages, John, Monophysite, president of a school of philosophy at Constantinople, 460.
- Asterius, papal legate, 263.
- Astorga, Synod at, A.D. 446, 175.
- Ἀστυχῦται*, etc., 331, 350.
- Athanasius, S., his Christology, 3, 4; creed attributed to, 4.
- Athanasius of Perrha, 174, 257, 380.
- Athanasius of Thessalonica, 256.
- Athanasius, Monophysite monk, 461.
- Athanasius of Doliche, 150.
- Augustine, S., is specially invited to the third Œcumenical Synod, 41.
- BAN. (See "Excommunication.")
- Baptism, whether the dumb and those who have lost their reason may be baptized, 161, 162; baptism of possessed persons, 162; children may not be baptized by heretics, 400; what heretical baptism is valid and which not, 169. (Cf. art. on "Re-baptism," vol. ii. 393).
- Baptistery, catechumens are not to enter, 163.
- Baradaï, Jacob, 462.
- Barsumas, Monophysite Archimandrite from Syria, at the Robber-Synod, 222, 249; murderer of Flavian of Constantinople, 255, 336.
- Basil, Bishop of Seleucia, 192, 202, 203, 242; he recants at the Robber-Synod, 248, 253; his vote for Eutyches and against Flavian, 250, 252; his statements at Chalcedon, 253, 306, 312; he is to be deposed, 314; is pardoned, 332.
- Basil, papal legate, 268, 278.
- Bassianus, Archbishop of Ephesus, 173, 370 ff.
- Benedictio penitentia*, 170.
- Benedictio viatica*, 160.
- Benediction of deaconesses, 163. (See "Deaconesses" and "Virgins.")
- Bequests, pious, whoever does not make them over to the church, is to be treated as an unbeliever, 165.
- Berinianus, Archbishop of Pergæ, temporary president of the third Œcumenical Synod, 98.
- Berytus, commission of inquiry at, 178, 359 ff.; the Bishop of Berytus arrogates to himself metropolitan rights, 340, 342.
- Besançon, Synod at, A.D. 444, 171.
- Bishop, consecrated to a diocese must accept the office, 373; many were unjustly consecrated against their will, 163, 173, 371, 373; bishops who are not able to write, 242; very criminal bishops, 174, 324, 325, 326, 362, 364; no bishop may be elected without the consent of the metropolitan, 163; and only consecrated by several bishops, 168; he must be consecrated within three months, 403; the Archbishops of Constantinople took money for dispensing episcopal ordination, 426; prevention of uncanonical ordination, 158; journeys of bishops, 296; the bishop must be present at Synods and ordinations, 164, 169, 404; he may only in peculiar cases accept another bishopric, 372, 390; rules to be observed in making complaints against bishops, 165, 394, 406; appeal may be made from the bishop to the Synod, 165 (cf. "Appeal"); no bishop may lightly accuse a colleague, 165; he must first try private exhortation, 166; no bishop may set aside ecclesiastical divisions and have recourse to secular, 394; a bishop can only be tried by twelve bishops or by the provincial Synod, he may not be degraded to the priesthood, 342, 420, 421; punishment of a bishop who consecrates an unworthy person, or a slave, or any one against his will, 158, 163; a previously schismatic bishop may become a country bishop, 158; exclusion of a bishop *ex caritate fratrum*, 405; and from taking part at a Council or in an ordination, 158; when a bishop should with-

- draw from communion with his colleagues, 166; deposed bishops, being also in the *communio laicalis*, receive sustentation from the church property, 370, 376, 381, 382; conspiracies against the bishop are forbidden, 404; no one may hold intercourse with the enemies of the bishop, 165; no bishop may encroach on another diocese or province, or ordain or receive clergy not his own, 161, 168, 169, 405; may not receive or have communion with any one who is excommunicated by his bishop, 161, 168; a bishop may only exceptionally have two sees, 77; he must have an *oeconomus* for the administration of the church property, 409, 410. The authority of a bishop extends over every one in his diocese, also over the monks and monasteries, 389, 390 (cf. art. "Monasteries"); bishops must be unmarried, and those who are married must abstain from matrimonial intercourse (see "Celibacy"); helpers of the bishops, 164; death and obsequies of a bishop, and property left by him, 158, 406, 407; in the fifth century the bishops numbered several thousand, 79.
- Bishopric: the boundaries of a bishopric were regulated according to the civil districts, 398, 399, 403, 412.
- Bonus, the baptism of the Bonosians is valid, 169.
- Britain, Synod in, A.D. 447, 178.
- CALLINICO, Peter of, 462.
- Candidian, Bishop of Antioch in Pisidia, accused of adultery, 257.
- Candidian, imperial commissioner at the third Œcumenical Synod, 43, 45, 46, 77, 78.
- Canons and collections of canons, ancient, 383; the earlier canons are cited at Chalcedon, 337, 339, 372, 378, 425; there, too, the canons of the earlier Synods are confirmed, 385; all imperial decrees which are in opposition to the canons are without effect, 312.
- Capreolus, Bishop of Carthage, writes to the third Œcumenical Synod, 50 f.
- Carosus, Monophysite Archimandrite, 335.
- Catechumens, 163, 168, 169.
- Catholicus, 463.
- Celibacy, a person twice married or who has married a widow cannot become one of the superior clergy, 163; vow of chastity must be taken, 168; he who is married when he is ordained may not have his wife in his house, unless she has taken the vow of chastity, nor his grandmother or mother, or his own daughter or niece, 168; no woman, no nun even, may enter the chamber of one of the superior clergy, 168.
- Celidonius, Bishop of Besançon, 172.
- Chalcedon, Œcumenical Synod there, A.D. 451, its previous history, 265 ff.; the Emperor Marcian summons the Council to Nicæa, 277; Pope Leo I. is opposed to the idea, 278 ff.; sends legates with instructions, 282, 283; the Emperor transfers the Synod to Chalcedon, 284; number and place of the sessions, 287; the synodal Acts and the translations of them, 288; the Roman deacon Rusticus improves the old Latin translation, 291; editions of the Acts, 293; the *Codes encyclicus*, 294; the imperial commissioners and the papal legates, presidency and number of those present, 295, 315, 320, 384; first session, 298; the papal legates speak only Latin, 298; they explain that an Œcumenical Synod cannot be held without the consent of Rome, 298; Dioscurus accused, 299; the Acts of the Synod at Constantinople under Flavian are read, 300; Theodoret is introduced, 300; cries, 300-303, 319; the minutes of the Robber-Synod are read, 303; complaints against the Robber-Synod, 301 f.; reading of the Acts of the Council under Flavian, 307 f.; particular bishops wish to excuse their former votes, 308-311; further reading of Acts, 311; the commissioners require that the bishops should set forth their faith in writing, 315; second session, 315; no new formulæ of the faith is to be drawn up, but the test given by Pope Leo must be universally received, 315, 316; the letter of Leo to Flavian is approved, 317, 330 f.; several bishops have doubts about three passages in it, 317; these doubts are removed, 318, 331; intercession for the heads of the Robber-Synod, 319; third session, 320; fresh complaint of Eusebius of Dorylaeum against Dioscurus, 320; Dioscurus is summoned, 321; four written complaints from Alexandria

against Dioscurus, 322 ff.; Dioscurus is deposed, 328, 329; fourth session, 329; the creed of Nicea as well as the letters of Cyril and of Leo I. are read and approved, 330; the Egyptians would not declare themselves because they had no archbishop, 333 f.; the Synod should elect an archbishop of Alexandria, 334; Carosus, Barsumas, and other Eutychiean monks come in, 335; the Eutychiean Archimandrite Dorotheus says, "One Person of the Trinity suffered," 338; case of Photius of Tyre, 340 f.; all imperial decrees which are in opposition to the canons are without effect, 342; fifth session, the declaration of faith prepared by a commission is read, 342; the legates are dissatisfied with it; the letter of Leo I. appears to them not to have been properly respected, they threaten to go away, 343; new commission for drawing up a declaration of faith, 345; their formula, 346; the Synod approves several letters of Cyril and those of Leo I., 347, 352; the allocation of the Synod to the Emperor that it is not possible to stand simply by the Nicene formula, 352; sixth session, the Emperor Marcian and Pulcheria are present, 353; the declaration of faith subscribed by all the bishops is read, 354; the Emperor proposes ordinances, 354; the bishops would like to depart, 355; the principal work of the Synod is ended, 355; seventh session, 355; the controversy respecting jurisdiction between Antioch and Jerusalem, 355 f.; eighth session, 356; Theodoret of Cyrus is brought up, 356; ninth and tenth sessions, case of Ibas, 358 ff.; eleventh and twelfth sessions, dispute between Bassianus of Ephesus and his rival, Bishop Stephen, 370 ff.; thirteenth session, strife between Nicomedia and Nicea on the subject of metropolitan rights, 377 ff.; fourteenth session and its two continuations, 379; strife between Sabinian of Perrha and his rival, Bishop Athanasius, 379 ff.; fifteenth session, the canons, 383-422; sixteenth session, the legates protest against what was done after their departure, that is, against the elevation of the See of Constantinople by the twenty-eighth canon, 410 ff.; close of the Synod, 428; the

Pope is asked to confirm the decrees of the Council, 429; Pope Leo I. rejects the twenty-eighth canon, 433, 441 f.; the Pope confirms the doctrinal decree of the Synod, 433, 434; the Greeks seem to sacrifice the twenty-eighth canon, 446; only in the thirteenth century Rome recognizes Constantinople as second in rank, 448, 449; imperial edicts in favour of the Synod and against the Monophysites, 438.

Chaldean Christians, 156.

Chalice, costly and set with precious stones, 362.

Challos, the sinner, 363, 364.

Charisius, at the third Ecuemical Synod, 70.

Charitas fratrum, exclusion from the same. (See "Excommunication.")

Children, exposed, 166.

Chorepiscopus. (See "Country Bishop.")

Chrism: in Gaul the chrism was conferred only once, either at baptism or at confirmation, 160; country clergy should apply before Easter to their bishop for the chrism, 165; only priests, deacons, and sub-deacons may bring away the chrism, 165. (See "Confirmation.")

Christology, of Nestorius, 1 ff., 49 ff.; Christology of Apollinaris, 2 f.; of Athanasius and of the Gregories, 3, 4, 9; of Epiphanius, 3, 9; Christology of the Antiochenes and of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 4 f.; of Nestorius, 12 ff., 44; of S. Cyril of Alexandria, 17 ff., 21, 28 ff., 31 ff., 137, 138, 140 ff.; of Eutyches, 186, 192, 198, 200 ff., 214, 215, 338; the doctrine of the *μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη* and *ἑνωσις φυσική*, 4, 32, 38, 141, 142, 144, 310.

Chrysaphius, minister patron of Eutyches, 187, 189, 221; is executed, 269.

Chrysologus, Peter, Archbishop of Ravenna, 206.

Church, ban of. (See "Excommunication.")

Church, freedom given in the, 161; if a bishop founds a church in a strange diocese, he has not the right to consecrate it, 161.

Church property, arrangements for the protection of, 409, 410; the income of an endowed church belongs to itself, 408, 409; every bishop must have an *œconomus* for the admini-

- stration of the church property, 409, 410; deposed bishops receive sustentation from the church property, 370, 376, 381, 382.
- Church vessels, silver, 362.
- Ciborium*, 162.
- Cilicia: the Cilician bishops are opposed to the union from their attachment to Nestorius, 148; they accept the union, 151.
- Circumscription of bishoprics, 402, 403.
- Clement of Rome, his pretended letter to the Apostle James, 165.
- Clerics, whoever marries a second time, or a widow, or a fallen woman, cannot become one of the higher clergy, 163, 172; exceptionally those who had married twice were bishops, 184; no eunuch or self-mutilated person, 168; no neophyte, 167; no person who has been possessed, 162; as exceptions, there were bishops who could not write, 242; punishment of bishops who ordain an unworthy person, or a slave, or any one against his will, 158, 163; married men may not be ordained as deacons or priests, 163, 168; no one may be absolutely ordained, 391; may not stay with a strange bishop, or in a strange town, or go over to another church, 169, 390, 405; may not travel without permission and letters of commendation from his bishop, 169, 397; must not, without such letters of commendation, either communicate or officiate in a strange city, 399; clerics may not be appointed to two churches at the same time, 397; interdiction of *clerici* and *monachi vagi*, 169; clerics may, indeed, carry on a trade, but may not take toll or practise usury, 169, 388; whether a cleric may ever undertake a guardianship, 388, 389; may not be disobedient to his bishop, 393; deposed clerics also receive sustentation, 370, 376, 381, 382; may take no secular office nor military service, 392; under what conditions apostate, schismatic, and heretical clerics may be received into the church, 76, 77; no cleric may set aside an ecclesiastical judgment, or without the consent of the bishop appeal to the secular judges, 394; who appear as witnesses or complainants against a cleric, 406; punishment of disobedience, 393; no reader may marry a heterodox wife, nor continue marriage with such, 400; a cleric may not allow his children to be baptized by heretics, and may not marry them to heretics, Jews, or heathens, 400.
- Cœlestin I., Pope, 19, 25 f., 40, 42, 48, 117; he dies A.D. 432, 118.
- Cœlestius, head of the Pelagians, 11.
- Commendaticie littere*, 399.
- Communicatio idiomatum*, 8, 15, 16, 31, 142.
- Communio laicalis*, 382.
- Communio peregrina*, 158.
- Communion. (See "Eucharist.")
- Complaints, against bishops, who may complain of them, and what is to be observed in such complaints, 166, 394, 406; against clerics, 160, 394, 406; those who make false complaints are to be punished, 170.
- Condo baudites, 461.
- Confirmation, in case of necessity a priest also may give it, 160; if anointing with the chrism was conferred at baptism, it should not be repeated at confirmation, 160.
- Cononitas, 161.
- Consecrare* = mix, 162.
- Consecration, of churches, 161; consecration of clerics. (See arts. "Ordination" and "Clerics.")
- Constantinople, bishopric; the Bishop of Constantinople claims power over the exarchate of Ephesus, Caesarea, and Thrace, 375, 412; he receives particular rights in disputes with metropolitans, 394 f., 403; instruction of Pope Leo with regard to the pretensions of Constantinople, 283; at the Robber-Synod the Bishop of Constantinople has the fifth place, 241, 303; Dioscurus desires to keep for the see of Alexandria precedence over that of Constantinople, 184, 221; the Council of Chalcedon gives the second place to the Bishop of Constantinople, 411 ff.; opposition of Rome, 283, 420, 424 f., 435 ff.; the Greeks appear willing to yield, 446 ff.; Rome first acknowledges the high rank of Constantinople in the thirteenth century, 448, 449; temporary schism between Rome and Constantinople, 454.
- Constantinople, city: Arians in it, 10; people and clergy are true to the orthodox faith in the time of Nestorius and Eutyches, 12, 14,

- 78 f., 81, 89, 90, 92, 265; exceptions, 78.
- Constantinople, the following Synods there, A.D. 431, 116, A.D. 448, 189; Eutyches is accused and summoned, 189 ff.; declaration of faith of this Synod, 191; tomes of Eutyches, 193; sentence of the Synod, 203; examination on account of the pretended falsification of the Acts, 211; when the sentence against Eutyches was conceived, 218; two Synods, A.D. 450, 271.
- Conversio* = *votum castitatis*, 168.
- Coptic Christians, 464.
- Corruptibility or incorruptibility of the body of Christ, 459.
- Corrupticolar*, 459.
- Council. (See "Synod.")
- Country bishops: schismatic bishops after their amendment are made country bishops, 153; privileges of a chorepiscopus, 158.
- Country parishes, 402, 403; to what bishopric a country parish belongs, 403.
- Cumulus beneficiorum*, 76, 396, 397.
- Cyprus: the Cypriote bishops complain of the Patriarch of Antioch, 71.
- Cyril of Alexandria, opposes Nestorius, 17; sets forth the orthodox doctrine, 17 f., 21, 29 ff., 122, 140 ff.; his anathematisms, 31; what he understands by *physis* and *hypothesis*, 32 f., 141 f.; his letters to Nestorius, 19, 20; to the Emperor and the Empress, 22; to the Pope, 24; he receives the commission to publish the papal sentence against Nestorius, 26, 27; he writes in the name of the Alexandrian Synod to Nestorius, and lays before him an orthodox confession of faith, together with the twelve anathematisms, 28 ff.; counter-anathematisms of Nestorius, 35; the Antiochene school is against Cyril, 37; Cyril saves the true doctrine of the Incarnation of the Logos, 39; he appears at the third Œcumenical Synod at Ephesus, 44; is its president, 46, 52, 65; he is deposed by the conciliabulum of the Antiochenes, 57; the Emperor confirms this, 82; Cyril is imprisoned, 86; complaints against Cyril, 91, 112; his presents, 133, 134; Cyril is released from prison, and returns to Alexandria, 110; proceedings with a view to union between Cyril and the Antiochenes, 115 ff.; Cyril accepts the formula drawn up by the Antiochenes, 131, 135, 137; the union takes place, 134 ff.; Cyril defends it, and in doing so, sets forth his doctrine, 139 ff.; the Monophysites endeavour to conceal themselves behind Cyril, 182; Cyril is reproached as though he had sacrificed orthodoxy, 139 f., 183 f.; Cyril dies, A.D. 444, 183; his successor, Dioscurus, confiscates his property, and persecutes his relations, 183, 184; Cyril's letters and anathematisms are confirmed at Ephesus and Chalcedon, 21, 47 f., 48, note 2, 317, 330, 337; Cyril is opposed to raising Jerusalem to a patriarchate, 77.
- DALMATIUS, abbot at Constantinople, 78, 92, 96.
- Damionites, 462.
- Daniel, Bishop of Carræ, very criminal, 180, 259, 363, 366.
- Deacon: no neophyte shall become a deacon, 167; if no priest is there, he may administer the Holy Communion, 169; he may not sit in the Secretarium among the priests, 169. (See "Clerics" and "Celibacy.")
- Deaconesses, 158, 163, 401.
- Dead, offerings and masses for the dead, also for penitents and excommunicated persons, 165, 169.
- Dead. (See "Oblata," "Excommunication.")
- Diocese = Patriarchate, 316, 394, 411.
- Diodorus of Tarsus, 5, 155.
- Dioscurus, Archbishop of Alexandria, inclined to Monophysitism, 183, 221, 224; he wishes to elevate his see above that of Ephesus, 183, 221; persecutes Theodoret, 185, 256; takes the excommunicated Eutyches into communion, 221; is president of the Robber-Synod, 224, 242 ff.; pronounces excommunication on Pope Leo the Great, 265, 268, 329; he is excommunicated at a Roman Synod, 265; he endeavours to prevent the recognition of the Emperor Marcian, 269; he is to have no seat in the new Synod (at Chalcedon), 283; he is accused at Chalcedon, 298 ff.; his followers fall away, 313, 314, 321; his violent acts at the Robber-Synod, 313 f.; his wicked life and murderous acts, etc., 324; he is deposed, 314, 328, 344.

Division, ecclesiastical, is arranged according to the civil, 341, 377, 378, 379, 402, 403, 410, 411

Domnus, Archbishop of Antioch, 173, 179; he was the first who accused Eutyches, 138; is at the Robber-Synod, and shows himself weak, 241, 252; he is, however, deposed, 257, 259.

Drivers, are excluded from communion, 170.

EASTER Eve, Fast-day, 164.

Easter, reckoning of Theophilus of Alexandria erroneous, 279.

Ἐκ δύο φύσεων or ἐν δύο φύσεσιν, 191, 311, 345, 348.

Eleusinius, friend of Eutyches, 193, 214.

Elias, Patriarch of Jerusalem, 455.

Elpidius, imperial commissioner at the Robber-Synod, 223, 243.

Emisa, Paul of, arranges the union between Cyril and the Antiochenes, 127 ff.

Emperor: the Emperors issue edicts in ecclesiastical affairs, particularly on questions of dogma, 116, 338, 339; all imperial decrees which are in opposition to the canons are without effect, 342; the Emperors summon Councils, 40, 185, 221; whether Emperors can raise a church to the rank of a metropolis, 341, 378, 398, 399, 410 ff.

Enmity: one who lives in enmity is excommunicated, 171.

Ἐνωσις φυσική in the sense of S. Athanasius and Cyril, 3, 141 ff.; μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου ἐσαρκωμένη, 4, 141, 310; ἔνωσις καὶ ὑπόστασις, 2, 3, 22, 29, 228, 348 ff.

Eparchy = ecclesiastical province, 393, 394.

Ephesus, rights of this see and its relation to Constantinople, 375.

Ephesus, the third Ecumenical Synod there, A.D. 431, 40 ff.; summoned by the Emperor, 40; the Pope gives his consent and sends legates, 42; Candidian is the imperial commissioner, 43; arrival of Nestorius, 44; first session, 44; Candidian and the Antiochenes protest against the immediate opening of the Synod, 46; number of the bishops present, 46, 51, 69; the president, 46, 52, 92; Cyril is representative of the Pope, 46, 62; the presides or heads of the Synod, 86, 91, 98; investigation respecting Nestorius, 47 ff.; patris-

tic passages are read, 48; also passages from the writings of Nestorius, 50; sentence on Nestorius, 51; Nestorius complains to the Emperor, 53; opposition against the sentence of the Synod, the conciliabulum of the Antiochenes, 53 ff.; sentence against Cyril and Memnon, 57; the Emperor is against the Synod and declares its sentence invalid, 59; the Synod writes to the Emperor, its second session, 61; the papal legates arrive, 62; third session, 64; fourth session, 65; fifth session, John of Antioch and his followers are excommunicated, 67; the Synod confirms the papal judgment on the Pelagians, 69; anathematizes them, 73, 74; sixth session, 70; every other creed except the Nicene is forbidden, 71; seventh session, a circular letter and canons, 73 ff.; the affairs of Pamphylia, the Massalians, Thrace and the see of Jerusalem, 76; the Synod and the Antiochenes appeal to the Emperor, 77; the Nestorians in Constantinople do not allow the reports of the Synod to reach the Emperor, 77; the Synod conveys intelligence to Constantinople through a beggar, 78; the monks march in front of the imperial palace, 78; the Synod is permitted to send envoys to the Emperor, 79, 81; false reports of the Antiochenes, 80; the Emperor confirms on the one side the deposition of Nestorius, on the other that also of Cyril and Memnon, and wishes to unite the Synod and the Antiochenes, 82; Cyril, Memnon, and Nestorius are imprisoned, 85 f.; the new imperial commissioner, John, seeks to unite Cyril and the Antiochenes, 88; the creed of the Antiochenes and their subsequent letters, 93; the Emperor summons before him deputies from both sides, 96; they are summoned to Chalcedon, 99; Nestorius is banished to his monastery, 99, 100; the conference at Chalcedon, 101; the Emperor decides in favour of the orthodox, and summons their deputies to Constantinople, 104; three memorials of the Antiochenes, 106 ff.; the Ephesine Synod is dissolved, 109; confirmed by the Pope, 117, 118; the Pope and the Emperor attempt to mediate, 118; negotiations for the union by Aristolaus, 121; the Antiochenes are split into three

- parties, 127; Paul of Emisa is sent to Alexandria as mediator, 127; the union creed of the Antiochenes is accepted by Cyril, 129; Cyril's presents, 133; the union takes place, 134; Cyril's letter, *Latentur Cæli*, often called "Ephesine Creed," 137 f.; the union finds opponents, but is defended by Cyril, 139; the union is at last, although not without constraint, accepted universally, 148.
- Ephesus, the Robber-Synod, its title, 241, 256, 260; its convocation, 210, 221; the imperial commissioners at it, 223; Dioscurus of Alexandria is appointed president by the Emperor, 224; the papal legates may not preside, 258; Pope Leo sends legates, 225, 239; his *Epistola dogmatica* to Flavian, 225; subsequent letters of the Pope on account of Eutyches, 237; the Pope does not consider the Synod necessary, 240; the proceedings at the Robber-Synod according to their own acts, 241 ff.; the principal proceedings lasted only one day, 241; number of the bishops present, 241, 242; first session, 242; the *Epistola* of Leo I. not read, notwithstanding repeated demands for it, 243, 246, 251, 255; only the friends of Dioscurus allowed to have notaries, the others forbidden to make notes, 244, 253; some had their fingers almost broken, 253, 305; Eutyches is introduced into the Synod, 244; his declaration and complaints of Flavian of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorykeum, 244 f.; Eusebius of Dorykeum is not again to be heard, 246; Eutyches suspects the papal legates, 246; reading of the Acts of the Synod of Constantinople in A.D. 448, 246 ff.; recantation of several bishops who had wished to speak differently at Constantinople, 247; subsequent reading of the Acts, 247 f.; Flavian not allowed to speak, 249; Eutyches is declared to be orthodox, and is reinstated in his dignities, 249; Flavian of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorykeum are deposed, 251; Flavian appeals, 251, 255, 259; the papal legates protest against the decree of the Synod, 252, 255, 258; testimonies of antiquity respecting the Robber-Synod, 252 ff.; Dioscurus conquers by means of money, intimidation, and brute force, 251, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 299, 300 f.; he compelled the bishops to sign a blank paper, 253, 255, 300, 301, 303, 305; those who refused were shut up, 253, 302, 305; many were threatened with death, 302, 303; they stood in danger of their life, 257, 303; Dioscurus compelled all by means of his three hundred monks and soldiers, their swords and sticks, 253, 254, 253, 302, 305, 313, 314; many of the bishops did not fully understand the affair, 302, 303; some bishops clasped in vain the knees of Dioscurus, 254, 314; Barsumas cried, "Strike Flavian dead," 255, 336; the papal legate Hilary only saves himself by flight, 255-257; fortunes of the papal legates, 260 ff.; the Robber-Synod deposes Bishop Theodoret of Cyrus, the Patriarch Domnus of Antioch, Ibas, and other bishops, 256, 257, 259; Flavian of Constantinople was beaten and exiled, and died after three days, 258-260; the Emperor Theodosius is for, Pope Leo against the Robber-Synod, 263 ff.; Pope Leo urges the holding of a new Synod, 265, 266.
- Ephesus, previous Synod there, A.D. 445, 173.
- Ἐπισκοπιον = bishop's residence, 199.
- Epistola formatæ, epistolia* or *apostolia*, 397, 398; *commendatitiæ*, 397-400.
- Etshmiadsin, 463.
- Eucharist, horse and carriage drivers and actors are excluded, 170; the Eucharist is the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, 363; at the communion of the people new and bad wine may not be used, 363; the Viaticum is to be given to sick penitents, 160; whether also to possessed persons and to those who have lost their reason, 162; a small portion of the Eucharist is to be laid in the chalice, 162.
- Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons, 159.
- Euchites. (See "Massaliens.")
- Eudocia, Empress, 22, 449.
- Eudoxia, Empress, 266.
- Eulogius, imperial commissioner at the Robber-Synod, 223.
- Ennechs, self-made, cannot become clergy, 168.
- Eusebius, Bishop of Ancyra, 213, 314.
- Eusebius, Bishop of Dorykeum, opponent of Nestorius, 14; opponent of Eutyches, 188, 189 ff.; is full of fire in his accusation, 194; he is accused by Eutyches at the Robber-Synod, 245 ff.; is deposed, 251; he com-

- plains to the Emperor, 252, 253; his second complaint in writing, 254; is in exile at Rome, 271, 273; complains at Chalcedon, 299, 304, 307, 320 ff.
- Eustathians. (*See* art. "Meletius of Antioch," vol. i. 275).
- Eustathius, Bishop of Berytus, 179, 246, 309, 314, 340.
- Eutherius, Bishop of Tyana, opposed to the union, 118, 127, 132; is deposed, 152.
- Eutyches, zealous opponent of Nestorius, 134, 179; his previous history, 186 f.; Cyril thinks much of him, 187; Pope Leo I. was more cautious, 187; Eutyches cannot grasp the difference between orthodox and oriental Dyophysitism, 188; Domnus of Antioch the first who came forward against him, 188; after that Eusebius of Dorylaeum accused him at the Synod at Constantinople, A.D. 448, 189; Eutyches will not appear before the Synod, 191 ff., 194; his doctrine, 192, 198, 201 ff., 213, 214; he maintains that the body of Christ is not of the same substance with ours, 192, 338; he undervalues tradition, 192; his *σῆμος*, 193; he stirs up the monks, 196; he is rich and has great influence, 201; Eutyches at last appears before the Synod, 199 f.; he will accept the expression "of two natures," but not "in two natures," 201 ff.; he is deposed and expelled from the church, 204; on his return home is insulted by the populace, 204; he complains to the Emperor, 205; writes to the Pope and to other bishops, 204, 205; asserts that he had appealed to Rome before the sentence of the Synod, 205, 209, 218; the imperial commissioner Florentius declares that Eutyches had only, after the end of the Synod, said to him quietly that he appealed, 218; Eutyches gains the favour of the court, 205, 210; he complains of the falsification of the synodal Acts; examination of them on this account, 211 ff.; whether the judgment against Eutyches had not been already decided on beforehand, 218, 219; Eutyches appears at the Robber-Synod, 244; is here declared to be orthodox, and restored, 249; is excommunicated at a Roman Synod, 265; after the Synod at Chalcedon, the Emperor Marcian put forth a very stringent decree against the Eutychians, 440 f.; and Eutyches was condemned to banishment, 441; he died, A.D. 454, 441.
- Exarch = superior metropolitan, 394.
- Excommunication, 161, 168-171, 401, 402; excommunicated persons are excluded from all intercourse with others, no one may speak to them, 171; horse and carriage drivers and actors are excommunicated, 170; also apostate monks, 170; criminals guilty of capital crimes are excommunicated for life or for a very long time, and condemned to severe penance, 170; an excommunicated person, particularly a cleric, may not be received elsewhere, 161, 168; exclusion from the *communio* or *cavitas fratrum*, 169, 405; *communio peregrina*, 158.
- Exemptions of the monasteries not permitted in the ancient church, 389, 390.
- Exposed children, 166.
- FACUNDUS, Bishop of Hermione, defender of the three chapters, 188.
- Filioque, 176.
- Firmus, Bishop of Caesarea, 128.
- Flavian, afterwards Archbishop of Antioch, 455.
- Flavian, Archbishop of Constantinople, 179, holds a Synod against Eutyches, A.D. 448, 189 ff.; his desire for peace, 195; he publishes the sentence against Eutyches, 207; his correspondence with Pope Leo the Great, 208 f.; the Emperor requires of him a confession of faith, 211; Flavian is deposed and maltreated at the Robber-Synod, he dies, A.D. 449, 245, 250, 251, 258-260; Dioscurus and Barsumas are called his murderers, 255, 302, 308, 336; Flavian's body is brought to Constantinople and solemnly laid in the basilica of the apostles, 271; Flavian is declared orthodox by the Synod at Chalcedon, 309.
- Fritilas, Archbishop of Heraclea, 77.
- Fullo, Peter, 451, 452, 454.
- GAIANAS and the Gaianites, 459.
- Galicia, Synod there, A.D. 447, 175.
- Gaul, which the primatial see, 157, 172.
- Gaul, Synod in, A.D. 447, 178.
- Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, 172.
- Gobarus, Stephen, Trithemist, 461.
- "God was crucified," whether this expression is permissible, 338, 451.

God-bearer, Origen and Athanasius had already used the expression, 8, 49 f.; Theodore of Mopsuestia opposes it, 9; likewise Nestorius, 12 ff., 15; Bishop Proclus defends the expression, 14; Nestorius will suffer the expression in part, 16 f.; he gives a false meaning to the orthodox expression, 16, 17; Cyril defends the expression, 17 f.; John of Antioch also is in favour of it, 27; importance of the expression *θεοτόκος*, 39; the Antiochenes are not agreed regarding this expression, 88; they accept it, 93; the expression is admitted into the union creed, 137; likewise at Chalcedon, 347, 348, 350, 351.

Gregory of Nazianzus, his Christology, 4.

Gregory of Nyssa, 4, 9.

Guardianship: under certain circumstances, a cleric may undertake a guardianship, 388, 389.

HEATHENISM: a bishop may not permit unbelievers in his diocese to light torches and trees, or to honour fountains, etc., 170; marriages with heathen are forbidden, 400.

Helladius, Bishop of Tarsus, opposed to the union, 118, 126, 132, 148, 149; he accepts the union along with the other bishops of Cilicia Prima, 153.

Henoticon of the Emperor Zeno, 452.

Heretics and schismatics, under what conditions they may be received into the church, 76, 77; imperial orders against heretics, 145, 153, 439 ff.

Heretics, baptism by: punishment of a Catholic who allows his children to be baptized by heretics, 400.

Hierapolis, Synod at, A.D. 445, 174.

Hilary, Archbishop of Arles, 157, 159, 167, 172.

Hilary, papal legate at the Robber-Synod, 225, 242, 251, 255 ff., 260 ff.

Himerius of Nicomedia, opponent of the union, 118, 132, 145; he at last joins the union, 151.

Hormisdas, Pope, 455, 458.

Host, the, and chalice, to be mixed, 162.

Hypatius, Bishop of Ephesus, 456.

Hypostasis, is used in the sense of person and of nature, 35.

Hypostatic union. (See "Unio.")

IBAS of Edessa, 155, 178; investigation respecting him at Berytus and Tyre, 179 ff.; he is deposed at the Robber-Synod, 259; his case is examined at

Chalcedon, 358 ff.; complaints against him that he had wasted church property, had taken money for ordinations, etc., 362 f.; his letter to the Persian Maris, 366; at Chalcedon Ibas is restored to his bishopric, 369.

Idol-worship. (See "Heathenism.")

Intercalary income, belongs to the church concerned, 408, 409.

Intercessor or *Interventor*, 163, 164.

Irenaeus, Count, patron of Nestorius at the third Œcumenical Synod, 43; he works at Constantinople for the Antiochenes, 79-81; becomes Bishop of Tyre, although twice married, 184; deposed, 185, 259.

Isidore of Pelusium, blames S. Cyril, 83, 139, 183.

JACOB BARADAI, 462.

Jacob of Nisibis, 151.

Jacobites, 463.

Jerusalem, hitherto under Antioch, desires to become a patriarchate, 77; receives at Chalcedon a patriarchal jurisdiction, 355, 356, 382.

Jews, marriage with, forbidden, 400.

John, Patriarch of Antioch, 11, 26; early friend of Nestorius, 27; counsels him to yield and approves the *θεοτόκος*, 27 f.; is dissatisfied with the anathematisms of Cyril, 37; comes too late to the third Œcumenical Synod, 44; his relation to the same (see art. "Ephesus, third Œcumenical Synod there"); his subsequent proceedings with a view to union with Cyril, 115 ff.; his union creed, 129; his letters of union, 135; he recognizes the deposition of Nestorius and his heresy, 135, 136; conclusion of the union, 136; John applies to the Emperor to carry the union through, 148.

John Ascunages, 460.

John, Bishop of Constantinople, 455.

John, Bishop of Germanicia, 343.

John Maxentius, a monk in Constantinople, 458.

John, imperial commissioner at the third Œcumenical Synod, 82.

John Niceota or Machiota, 455.

John Philoponus, 460.

John Talala or Tabenesiota, 453.

Judgment, ecclesiastical and secular. (See "Bishops" and "Clerics.")

Judices = high officers of State, 295, note 2.

Julian, Bishop of Cos, papal legate,

- 239, 274, 275, 277, 278, 280, 286, 345, 382.
- Julian, Bishop of Halicarnassus, head of the Monophysites, 459.
- Julian, Bishop of Eclanum, 11.
- Julius, Bishop of Puzzuolo, papal legate at the Robber-Synod, 225, 241, 258, 262.
- Justin I., Emperor, 455.
- Justin II., Emperor, 461.
- Justinian, Emperor, 455; he is for the formula, "one of the Trinity was crucified," 458.
- Justinianensis Synodus*, A.D. 441, 159.
- Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, wishes to become patriarch, 77; he is weak at the Robber-Synod, 224, 241, 249, 252, 301, 304 f.; is deposed at Chalcedon, 330; is pardoned, 332; is a member of the commission for drawing up a formula of faith, 345; he is driven away by the Monophysites, 449.
- LAITY, chalice of, 363.
- Lapsi*, 300.
- Lawsuits, 394; on lawsuits before episcopal and secular judges. (See art. "Bishop," "Judgment," and "Clerics.")
- Lay communion, *communio laicalis*, 382.
- Lazarists, 464.
- Leo I., the Great, Pope, 171 ff.; he answers the letter of Eutyches cautiously, 187; Eutyches seeks help from Leo, 206; Leo's correspondence with Flavian of Constantinople, 208 f., 221; he is invited to the Robber-Synod, 225; he sends legates, 225, 241, 242 f.; his celebrated *Epistola dogmatica* to Flavian, 225 ff.; it is not read at the Robber-Synod, 243, 246, 251, 255, 304, 317; but was approved at Chalcedon, 317 f., 330, 343 f., 347, 351; this *Epistola* is the rule of faith, 432; the Bishops of Illyricum and Palestine have some doubts respecting it, 317 f., 331 f.; subsequent letters of Leo with reference to the Robber-Synod, 237 ff., 255, 265 f.; Leo holds a Roman Synod in opposition to the Robber-Synod, 264, 265; he desires that the new large Synod should be held in Italy, 265 f.; under certain conditions, however, he deems it unnecessary, 268, 400; he is dissatisfied when the Emperor Marcian summons the Synod first to Nicaea and then to Chalcedon, 278 ff.; reasons for his view, 281 f.; he sends legates to preside at Chalcedon, and gives them instructions, 280, 283; he declares that there is a great difference between the ecclesiastical and the civil rank of a city, 413; whether the title "Œcumenical Patriarch" was offered to him at Chalcedon, 429; he is asked to confirm the decrees of Chalcedon, 431; he rejects the 28th canon, 433; subsequent correspondence between Constantinople and Rome, 441; Leo confirms the doctrinal decree of Chalcedon, 443, 444; he demands severity towards heretics, 451; he is excommunicated by Dioscurus and the Robber-Synod, 265, 268, 329.
- Leo I., Emperor, 451, 452.
- Leo II., Emperor, 452.
- Letters of commendation. (See "Epistolæ.")
- Letters of peace, in distinction from letters of commendation, 397. (See art. "Epistolæ.")
- Liberatus, Archdeacon of Carthage, his *Breviarium causæ Nestorianorum*, etc., 285, note.
- Litteræ*. (See "Epistolæ.")
- Lucentius, papal legate, 276, 278.
- Lunatics, whether they should be baptized, 162.
- Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, 178.
- MACEDONIUS, Bishop of Constantinople, 454.
- Manas, imperial commissioner, 211.
- Maphrian, 463.
- Marcian, Emperor, 269; he enters into friendly relations with Pope Leo I., and desires to oppose a new Synod to the Robber-Synod, 270; he summons an Œcumenical Council to Nicaea, 277; is himself present at the sixth session, 353; proposes canons, 354; his edicts for the Synod of Chalcedon and against the Monophysites, 438.
- Maris. (See "Ibas.")
- Marius Mercator, 11, 34.
- Marriage, the widows of clergymen may not marry, and the sons and daughters of clergymen are limited in their marriages, 401.
- Married twice, a man, can, at highest, be a subdeacon, 163; an exceptional bishop, 184.
- Martyrs, chapels of martyrs, *memoria martyrum*, 193, 335, 391.
- Massalians, 76.
- Maximian, Archbishop of Constantinople in the place of Nestorius, 115.

- Maximin, Bishop of Anazarbus, opponent of the union, 125.
- Maximus, Archbishop of Antioch, 297, 328, 341, 345, 370.
- Maximus, Archimandrite, friend of Eutyches, 197.
- Mechitarists, 464.
- Melchites, 464.
- Meletius, Bishop of Mopsuestia, 117, 145.
- Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus, very influential at the third Œcumenical Synod, a friend of Cyril, and with him at the head of the orthodox party, 44, 47; deposed by the Antiochenes, 57, 59, 67; the Synod invalidates this sentence, 66; but the Emperor confirms it, 82 ff.; Memnon is imprisoned, 86; is released, 110; his subsequent history, 173.
- Memoriae. (See "Martyrs, chapels of.")
- Mennas, Patriarch of Constantinople, 457.
- Mesopotamia, Monophysite, 463.
- Metropolis, civil metropolis not necessarily also ecclesiastical, 341, 378 f., 398 f., 403, 411 ff.; strife with regard to metropolitan rights between Berytus and Tyre, 340, 342; between Nicomedia and Nicaea, 376 f.
- Metropolitan, or *primæ sedis episcopus*, Rome defends the rights of the metropolitans against the Patriarch of Constantinople, 438.
- Μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη, 4, 32, 38, 141, 144, 310.
- Milan, Synod at, A.D. 451, 267.
- Military service, no cleric or monk may perform it, 392.
- Monasteries, may not be erected without the permission of the bishop, 389 f.; may not be converted into secular dwellings, 403; their goods may not be used for secular purposes, 408; the clerics of the monastery remain under the bishop of the city, 393. (See art. "Monks.")
- Mongus, Peter, 450, 452, 453.
- Monks: no slave may be received as a monk, 389 f.; monks are to receive due honour, but they may not run about, nor confuse the affairs of Church or State, must love quiet, give themselves to fasting and prayer, not encumber themselves with ecclesiastical and secular affairs, 389 f.; they may not return to the world, 170, 392; may not perform military service, 392; may not marry, 401 f. (See "Monasteries.")
- Monophysitism, alleged, of S. Athanasius, 3; character of Monophysitism, 182; it is in the Acts often called Apollinarianism, 182, 188; it already existed before Eutyches appeared, 183; the Monophysites already at that time persecuted orthodox bishops, 184, 188; Monophysitism of Eutyches, 192, 198, 200 ff., 213, 338; the Monophysites desire to range themselves behind S. Cyril, 182; owing to Monophysitism various Synods were held at Constantinople, A.D. 448, at Ephesus (the Robber-Synod), and Chalcedon (see these articles); imperial edicts against the Monophysites, 438 ff.; subsequent history of Monophysitism, 449 ff.; parties among the Monophysites, 454 ff.
- Montana, her unseemly relations with Dioscurus, 324.
- NATURES in Christ, doctrine of these, 1 ff., 16, 21, 29 ff., 49 f., 94, 130, 137, 141 ff., 191, 200 ff., 225 ff., 346 ff.
- Nectarius, Archbishop of Vienne, 164.
- Neophyte, a neophyte not to be ordained priest or deacon, 167.
- Nerses of Ashtarak, Patriarch of Armenia, 463.
- Nestorius, 9; is a friend of the Pelagians, 11; his doctrine, 12 ff., 16, 17, 20; his conflict with Cyril begins, 17; his counter-anathematisms against Cyril, 31; the Emperor Theodosius II. is for Nestorius, 23; Nestorius desires to depose Cyril, 23, 24; the Pope and the Roman Synod pronounce against Nestorius, 25; letters of Nestorius to Pope Celestine, 19, 27; Nestorius is warned by John of Antioch, 27; what Cyril and his Synod require of Nestorius, 28 ff.; Nestorius replies only by his counter-anathematisms, 34; on account of Nestorius, the third Œcumenical Synod is held at Ephesus and he is deposed (see "Ephesus, third Œcumenical Synod"); Nestorius is exiled, later, to Arabia, then banished to Egypt, his writings are burnt, his followers named Simonians, 153; overthrow of Nestorianism, 154 ff.; remnant of it, 156, 222.
- Nicaea, bishopric, in strife with Nicomedia about metropolitan rights, 376, 377.
- Nicaea, whether the third Œcumenical Synod forbade the addition of any-

- thing to the Nicene Creed, 305, 337, 351 f.; at the Robber-Synod it was forbidden to go beyond the Nicene Creed, 251; the Nicene and Sardican canons were confused, 265.
- Nicaea, A.D. 451, the third Œcumenical Synod was summoned to Nicaea, but immediately transferred to Chalcedon, 277, 284.
- Nicoeta, John (Machiota), 455.
- Nicomedia, in strife with Nicaea, 377 f.
- Niobes, Stephen, and the Niobites, 462.
- OBLATA = offerings and presents to the church. Offerings for the dead, also for penitents and excommunicated persons and funeral masses, 165, 169.
- Œconomus, 409, 410.
- Œcumenical patriarch, whether the fourth Œcumenical Synod offered this title to Pope Leo I., 429.
- Offering. (See "Oblata.")
- Οἰκονομία, μυστήριον τῆς τοῦ κυρίου οἰκονομίας = mystery of the Incarnation, 347.
- Orange, Synod at, A.D. 441, 159.
- Ordination, absolute ordination is forbidden, 391 f.; *illegal* and *un-allowed* are often not sufficiently distinguished, 392; all ordinations must be without payment, but it was not always so, 362, 427.
- Orphans and widows, the church cares for them, 388, 389.
- PASCHA. (See "Easter.")
- Paschasinus, papal legate at Chalcedon, 278, 279, 296, 323, 343, 354, 385, 423 ff.
- Patriarch, Œcumenical, whether the fourth Œcumenical Synod gave this title to Pope Leo I., 429.
- Patriarchate, 411 ff. (See art. "Constantinople, bishopric.")
- Paul of Emisa, mediator for the union, 127.
- Paul of Samosata, the baptism of his followers is invalid, 169.
- Pelagians, their doctrines and Synods on their account, 178; the papal judgment on the Pelagians is confirmed at Ephesus, 69, 73, 74; Nestorius is for the Pelagians, 11; among the Nestorians are Pelagians, 86, 98.
- Penitents, during the time of penitence no one was allowed to marry or to have married intercourse, 170; sick persons received the *Viaticum* or the *benefdictio penitentia*, but if they recovered must continue the works of penance, 160; if contrite penitents die unexpectedly without the communion, oblations shall be accepted for them, 165, 169.
- Penitents = ascetics, 170.
- Peregrina communio*, 158.
- Perrha, Synod at, A.D. 445, 174.
- Peter Chrysologus, Archbishop of Ravenna, 206.
- Peter of Callinico, 462.
- Peter Fullo, 451, 452, 454.
- Peter Mongus, 450, 452, 453.
- Phantasiastæ, 459.
- Philippus Sidetes, 116.
- Philoponus, John, and the Philoponites, 460, 461.
- Philoxenus, Xenaias, 455, 459.
- Photinians, their baptism is not valid, 169.
- Photius, Bishop of Tyre, 179, 272, 340 f.
- Phthartolatrai, 459.
- Pope and Œcumenical Synod, how Pope Celestine understood the relation of the two, 42, 62.
- Priests, what functions belong to them, 158, 160, 164, 165; must bring away the chrism from their own bishop, through whom? 165; may give the benediction in private houses but not in church, 158; priests who are allowed to baptize should always be provided with the chrism, 160; a sick bishop may not allow his episcopal functions to be discharged by a priest, 164. (See the art. "Clerics," "Celibacy," and "Country Parishes.")
- Primacy, papal, was acknowledged at the third Œcumenical Synod, 62, 63; likewise at the fourth Œcumenical Synod, 297, 298, 427-429; likewise by Peter Chrysologus, 206; by Theodoret, 264; by Eutyches, 265; by the Emperor Valentinian III., 266; by the Emperor Marcian, 270, 441, 442; by the Patriarchs of Constantinople and other Greeks, 267, 429-433, 447; the Latin text of the sixth Nicene canon, as it was laid down at Chalcedon, speaks of the primacy, 424. (See art. "Appeal" and "Pope.")
- Priscillianists, 171, 175 ff.
- Proclus, Bishop of Cyzicus, 116; appears against Nestorius, 14 f.; becomes Bishop of Constantinople, 148, 150; gives warning against the errors of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 154; dies, 189.

- Proterius, Archbishop of Alexandria, 450.
- Pulcheria, S. Cyril writes to her, 22; co-regent, 22; she becomes Empress and marries Marcian, 269; slanders on her, 112; her zeal for orthodoxy, 133, 134; Pope Leo the Great writes to her on account of the heresy of Eutyches, 237, 265, 267, 273, 275, 276; she writes to the Pope, 270; Pope Leo says through her influence the Eutychian heresy, as well as the Nestorian, had been subdued, 273; she is present at the sixth session at Chalcedon, 353.
- QUARTODECIMANS, 70.
- RABULAS, Bishop of Edessa, 118, 128, 149, 154, 155, 367.
- Ravennius, Archbishop of Arles, 267.
- Readers may not marry heretical women, nor allow their children to be baptized by heretics, or to marry heretics, Jews, or heathen, 400.
- Recourse. (See "Appeal.")
- Regium. (See "Riez.")
- Renatus, papal legate at the Robber-Synod, 225, 258, 260.
- Riez, Synod there, A.D. 439, 157.
- Rome, Synods there, A.D. 430, 25; A.D. 444, 171; A.D. 445, 172; A.D. 447, 178; A.D. 449, 262, 264.
- Rome, temporary rupture between Rome and Constantinople. (See "Constantinople.")
- Rome's primacy. (See "Pope" and "Primacy.")
- Rusticus, Roman deacon, nephew and opponent of Pope Vigilius and the fifth Œcumenical Synod, improves the Latin translation of the Acts of Chalcedon, 291, 292.
- SABINIAN, Bishop of Perrha, 174, 259, 381.
- Sardican and Nicene canons confused, 265.
- Schismatic bishops and clerics, 158. (Cf. art. "Heretics.")
- Secretaria* = sessions of the fourth Œcumenical Synod, 286, 288.
- Secretarium*, a building adjoining the church in which Synods were often held, 163, 173, 189.
- Secularization of the property of monasteries is forbidden, 408.
- Selucus, Bishop of Amasia, 213, 216, 242, 247, 250, 252.
- Severus, Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, 455, 456, 459.
- Silverius, Pope, his death, 457.
- Simeon Stylites, 120, 151.
- Simonians = Nestorians, 153.
- Simony forbidden, 386, 387, 427.
- Singers may not marry heretical women, 400; may not allow their children to be baptized by heretics, 400; nor marry them to heretics, Jews, or heathen, 400.
- Sixtus III., Pope, 118; rejoices over the restoration of peace in the church, 139.
- Stephen, Archbishop of Ephesus, 373.
- Stephen Gobarus, 461.
- Stephen Niobes, 462.
- Subdeacon: the subdeacon was often cut off from higher orders, 163.
- Suspension, temporary, 384.
- Συνάφεια* of the two natures in Christ, 24, 29, 31, 35.
- Synod, Œcumenical, how Pope Celestine apprehended the relation of the Pope to an Œcumenical Synod, 42, 62, 63; how Leo the Great, 279, 280; the appearance of the Pope in person at an Œcumenical Synod is not necessary, 240; the fourth Œcumenical Synod asks for confirmation from the Pope, 429 ff.; third Œcumenical Synod, 40 ff.; fourth, 285 ff.
- Syria, Monophysite, 463.
- Syrian Synods, A.D. 432, 121; A.D. 445, 173 f.
- TALATA, John, Patriarch of Alexandria, removed by the Monophysites, 453.
- Tarsus, Synod of the Antiochenes there, A.D. 432, 117.
- Tetradites, Monophysites, 462; quartodeciman. (See "Quartodecimans.")
- Thalassius, Archbishop of Casarea, 211, 213, 224, 243, 251; is responsible with others for the Robber-Synod, 301; he is threatened with deposition at Chalcedon, 314; is pardoned, 332; is member of the commission there for drawing up the formula of faith, 345.
- Themistians, Monophysite sect = Agnoetae, 460.
- Theodora, Empress, consort of Justinian, favours the Monophysites, 456.
- Theodore Ascidas, Origenist, 459.
- Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia, his heresy, 5 f., 9; his creed, 70; Rabulas of Edessa first pronounces an anathema upon him, 154; is

- called the father of the Nestorian heresy, 155.
- Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, combats the anathematism of Cyril, 38, 118; desires that the opening of the Synod of Ephesus should be deferred till the arrival of the Patriarch John of Antioch, 46; takes part in the schism of the Antiochenes, 58 ff.; complains of the Synod of Ephesus, 81; is sent by the Antiochenes as deputy to the Emperor, 97; takes part in the conference at Chalcedon, 99 ff.; speaks with the Emperor, 105; his discourse of complaint, 111; he works against a union with Cyril, 118, 121; he begins to judge more favourably of Cyril, 124, 126; he will not join in an anathema on Nestorius, 126, 127, 147; he is not altogether satisfied with the union, although he finds the new declarations of Cyril free from fault, 145-147; he takes up a middle position, 127, 148, 150; he separates himself for some time from his patriarch, 150; concludes peace with him, and joins the union on condition that he shall not have to sign the deposition of Nestorius, 152; he is persecuted by the Monophysites, 182, 185; imperial edicts against him, 185, 186; the Emperor forbids him to appear at the Robber-Synod, 222, 224; he does not hope for any good from this Synod, 240; he still suspects Monophysitism in Cyril's anathematism, 240; he is deposed at the Robber-Synod, 256, 259, 261, 263; his writings are prohibited by the Emperor, 263; he turns to Rome, 264; he is recalled from exile, and demands a new Synod, 271; Pope Leo the Great reinstates him in his bishopric, 300; he is at the Synod of Chalcedon, 300, 318; he is spurned by the Egyptians, 300, 301; he is restored, 357.
- Theodosians, a kind of Monophysites, 459.
- Theodosius, Monophysite Patriarch of Jerusalem, 449.
- Theodosius, Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, 459.
- Theodosius II., Emperor, is at the beginning for Nestorius, 23; he summons the third (Ecumenical Synod, 40; sends commissioners there, 43, 59; he is for the Antiochenes, 59; he confirms on one side the deposition of Nestorius, on the other that of Cyril and Memnon, 82; he summons deputies from both sides, 96, 99; he decides in favour of the orthodox, 104; he works for the union, 119 f.; he carries it through without violence, 148 ff.; his severities to the Nestorians, 153, 263; he is in favour of Eutyches, 210; summons the Robber-Synod, 221 f.; confirms their decrees, 263; will not have a fresh Synod, 266; dies, 268.
- Theopaschites, 458.
- Timothy, Patriarch of Constantinople, 454.
- Timothy the White, or Salophaciolus, Patriarch of Alexandria, 451.
- Toledo, Synod at, A.D. 447, 175.
- Trinity, doctrine of the, "one of the Trinity suffered, was crucified," 338, 451, 457.
- Trisagion, whether the words, "Who was crucified for us," may be affixed, 451, 457.
- Trithemists, Monophysite, 460, 461.
- Turibius, Bishop of Astorga, 175.
- Tyre and Berytus, commission of inquiry there on account of Ibas, 180, 358; strife between these two churches about metropolitan rights, 340, 341, 342.
- UNCHASTITY, penance for, 163.
- Unio hypostatica*, 3, 8, 21, 29, 31.
- Uranus, Bishop of Himeria, friend of Eutyches, 179.
- Usury is forbidden to the clergy, 169.
- ὁμοουσιος* in the sense of person and nature, 31; S. Cyril uses the expression *φύσις* in the sense of *ὁμοουσιος*, and inversely, 32.
- VAISON, Synod at, A.D. 442, 164.
- Valentinian III., Emperor, is for Pope Leo the Great, 266.
- Vasense concilium*, A.D. 442, 164.
- Vaticum*, 160.
- Vigilius, Pope, how he became Pope, 457.
- Village parishes. (See "Country Parishes.")
- Virgins, only the bishop may give benediction to, 158; punishment of a virgin devoted to God who goes astray or marries; she and her accomplice are to be punished, 171, 401, 402.

WIDOWHOOD, vow of this, and punishment for the breach of the vow, 163; punishment of him who violates a widow dedicated to God, 163; the bishop confers the widow's dress, 163.

Widows. (See arts. "Widowhood" and "Orphans.")

XENAIAS or Philoxenus, Bishop of Hierapolis, Monophysite, 455, 459.

ZAPHARAN, monastery, residence of a Monophysite patriarch, 463.

Zeno, Byzantine emperor, his *Henoticon*, 452.

Zeugma, Synod there, 146, 147.

750.21

6781 1

